

JPRS-TAC-86-042

29 MAY 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-042

29 MAY 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT
ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG Bundestag Debates SDI Agreement Consequences (Hamburg ARD Television Network, 23 Apr 86)	1
Austrian General Counters Arguments Against SDI (Wilhelm Kuntner; Vienna INDUSTRIE, 16 Apr 86)	2
Norway's Defense Minister Defends Wuerzburg SDI Statement (Alf Seeland; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 25 Mar 86)	8
Norwegian Labor Confederation Supports Soviet SDI Demands (Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 23 Apr 86)	10
NHK Interviews Nakasone on Preparations for Summit (Yasuhiro Nakasone Interview; Tokyo NHK Television Network, 25 Apr 86)	11
Experts Mission Recommends Participation in SDI Research (Tokyo KYODO, 23 Apr 86)	16
Scientists Take Part in Anti-SDI Campaign (Tokyo KYODO, 27 Apr 86)	18

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR's Zagladin Comments on Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting in Geneva (V. Zagladin; Moscow AGITATOR, No 2, Feb 86)	20
Soviet Delegation Arrives in Geneva for 5th Round of Talks (Moscow TASS, 6 May 86)	27

Seeks 'Concrete Solutions'	27
Karpov Comments	27
Preliminary Talks	28
Nitze Comments Decried	28
Sarney Scores Superpowers' Arms Race at Disarmament Conference (Sao Paulo O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO, 2 Apr 86)	30
SALT/START ISSUES	
TASS: Congress Urging Compliance With SALT II (Moscow TASS, 11, 19 Apr 86)	32
Senators' Letter to President	32
House Appeal	32
USSR: Reagan, Advisers To Decide on SALT II Adherence (Valeriy Korzin; Moscow Television Service, 15 Apr 86) ...	33
Moscow: U.S. 'Hawks' Urge Renunciation of SALT II (Boris Kalyagin; Moscow Television Service, 17 Apr 86) ...	34
U.S. Using Charges of Soviet Violations as 'Cover' (Moscow TASS, 24 Apr 86)	36
TASS: U.S. Envoy Meets With NATO Allies on SALT II Treaty (Moscow TASS International Service, 26 Apr 86)	38
Soviet Maj Gen Claims U.S. Attempting To Undermine SALT II (Yu. Viktorov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 27 Apr 86)	39
FRG Press Comments on Reagan's Adherence to SALT II (Cologne Deutschlandfund Network, 23 Apr 86; Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, 23 Apr 86)	41
'Positive Signal'	41
Decision 'Not Sufficient', Editorial	42
Norwegian Daily Supports Reagan on Nuclear Sub Decision (Editorial; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 24 Apr 86)	43
Briefs	
Commission Session Ends	45
Mobile MIRV Missile Plans	45
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
French Jets Equipped With Cruise Missiles (Paris AFP, 5 May 86)	46
EUROPEAN CONFERENCES	
FRG's Kohl Interviewed on Gorbachev Visit (Helmut Kohl Interview; Hamburg BILD, 24 Apr 86)	47

FRG Press Views Gorbachev Proposals at SED Congress (Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG, 22 Apr 86; Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURT RUNDSCHEAU, 22 Apr 86)	48
SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG Editorial, by Josef Joffe FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHEAU Article, by Karl-Heinz Baum	48 49
Canada: Yukon Legislature Opposes Cruise Testing (Vancouver THE SUN, 3 Apr 86)	51
Canada: Consortium To Build LLAD Air Defense System (Jeff Sallot; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 17 Apr 86)	52
PRC Envoy To UN on Disarmament Comments on Arms Race (Beijing XINHUA, 7 May 86)	54
PRC 'Working Paper' to UN Urges Disarmament Talks (Beijing XINHUA, 9 May 86)	56

/9986

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG BUNDESTAG DEBATES SDI AGREEMENT CONSEQUENCES

DW240853 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 1800 GMT 23 Apr 86

[Text] There are renewed quarreling in the Bundestag today over the Federal Government's SDI agreements with the United States. The primary bone of contention was the question whether or not the agreements with Washington would entail negative consequences for the FRG's trade with the east. Economics Minister Bangemann and his predecessor Lambsdorf said that such anxieties belong to the realm of fantasy. There is no such thing as an impairment of German exports.

The opposition holds an entirely different view. Floorleader Vogel and his deputy Roth stated that in future the Americans could demand consultations about German transactions with the East, thus preventing export permits. Vogel predicted the termination of the SDI agreement in the event of an SPD election victory.

/9274
CSO: 5200/2682

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

AUSTRIAN GENERAL COUNTERS ARGUMENTS AGAINST SDI

Vienna INDUSTRIE in German 16 Apr 86 pp 20-23

[Article by Gen Wilhelm Kuntner: "The Courage to Have Courage"]

[Text] Before we uncritically try to follow the propaganda wave spread by the Kremlin against the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) which was announced on 23 March 1983 by US President Ronald Reagan, we should give some thought to the motives underlying this vision.

They want to convince us that the USA intends by means of a more or less reliable space-based defense system to enable itself to implement its own nuclear potential with impunity against ICBMs of the USSR which are equipped with nuclear warheads.

We know that the security concept presently existing between both Super Powers and therefore also between the two military alliances of NATO and the Warsaw Pact rests on the principle of an indestructible ability to retaliate. If, therefore, one could prevent a retaliatory strike, then the way would be open to a first strike, or at least to extortion. But if one examines such considerations in a somewhat more objective way, these theses burst like soap bubbles.

In the first place, it seems to be forgotten that for years the Americans enjoyed a nuclear monopoly. There were never any serious fears that the Americans would use this superiority in order to eliminate the Soviet empire, although this occurred during the phase in which the Soviet Union was expanding its influence to include a number of Eastern European states.

Ready for the Garbage Heap

In the second place, Ronald Reagan has clearly indicated that he is not only willing to cooperate with the Soviet Union in the development of a space-based defense system, but also in a parallel way to reduce the nuclear potential. It appears desirable to develop methods which destroy weapons, not human beings. The Damocles sword of global annihilation would thereby be ready for the garbage heap.

It cannot be ruled out that one or the other of the emerging atomic powers could decide itself to develop or to "purchase" nuclear warheads and missile systems.

It is also not uninteresting in this regard to recall what Soviet Marshal Sokolovsky wrote 24 years ago in the standard work "Soviet Military Strategy:" "Possibilities are being studied for using a stream of fast-moving neutrons against rockets, in order to cause the warheads carried by the rockets to explode... Special attention is being paid to lasers. It is believed that in the future, any rocket and any satellite can be destroyed in this way."

As a nation and as a society, the Americans see themselves in the role of representing a certain morally-defined global system. Because of the doctrine of deterrence, which determines their strategic behavior, they have lost much of the shine on their halo. A nuclear equilibrium, which rests on the parity of terror, on fear and reprisal, involves the USA in the threatening scenario of a nuclear holocaust in an ominous and value-neutral way.

It is not for nothing that all over the world the fear of, indeed even revulsion towards, both Super Powers and their insidious arsenals are growing. The symmetry of evil is obliterating the differences between these giants; it equates the ideology of the suppression of individuals with the societal conditions of the basic rights of citizens, which are based on freedom. Moreover, there is a growing conviction that the decades-long march into the post-industrial society has already pushed ahead the decline in real production capacity to such an extent that the Western economies are no longer able without revolutionary technological advances to develop under their own power the necessary dynamic for a possible recovery. The enormous research efforts in the area of space technology and particle and plasma physics, which are only possible with state support, must also be regarded from this point of view. One critical effect of the exploitation of research results in important industrial processes promises to be a scientific-technological push for the entire economy.

Several months ago, Helmut Kohl expressed an idea which should also give rise to thought on the part of the Austrian business community: "Apart from whether or not research work will lead to the intended results, SDI will bring about a significant impetus to technological innovation in the US. A highly industrialized country like the FRG must not be allowed to fall behind technologically." Lothar Spaeth added an even clearer note of urgency: "Without participation in SDI, Western Europe would in ten to fifteen years fall behind into the second or even third rank."

In Austria, numerous politicians restrict themselves to parroting meaningless slogans created by Eastern propaganda, such as "Star Wars" or "the militarization of space." But not acting, more sooner than later, turns into an irreparable sin of omission.

Certainly, a small country, and one which is furthermore neutral, will never be able to keep pace with the exploding costs of research projects. Nonetheless, the light of our scientists need not be hidden under a basket; compulsory-deterring, in a certain sense [sic.]. Constraints imposed by a

policy of neutrality must certainly be observed; there are, however, no de jure constraints concerning neutrality. "Stop signs" (e.g., the ban on defense cooperation with the FRG) which have been agreed upon in international treaties must be followed.

There can be nothing in the way of a modest, joint participation in the research projects of other countries, in keeping with our situation. This is all the more true since it has long been clear in Western economies that it is only in unusual cases possible to observe a strict separation of research results into purely military and purely civilian applications.

The Courage to Fear?

In this regard, one must ask why Moscow and its Western devotees so vigorously attack the technological revolution. The fear that America could develop this into a military objective of world domination can most likely move only a few narrow-minded ideologues, who cling to the skeleton of the societal and economic situation that prevailed during the nineteenth century. They need anachronistic concepts such as bourgeoisie, capitalism and imperialism, on the one hand in order to give people "the courage to fear" and on the other hand to disguise the goal of world domination of the proletariat under the slogan of "peaceful coexistence."

The true concern, but also the silent hope, of those wielding power in the Kremlin of finally reaching the goal of world dictatorship can be explained in other terms. Without a doubt, in the Soviet Union as well, the effectiveness of the intellectual-technological potential and the strength of the free market economy must be correctly evaluated, when the innovative capacity by means of governmental impulses and the growing self-confidence of the Americans are combined.

The economic gap between the free market economy and the planned economy, which is slowed down by system-internal friction, will continue to widen. It cannot be overlooked that in the Eastern economies because of bureaucratic and political requirements the exchange of technological information, e.g., in the areas of electronics, physics, chemistry and biology, between the defense and the consumer goods sectors does not take place in a satisfactory way.

Uncoupling Other States

Therefore it will be in the interest of the Soviet Union to uncouple as many states of the western world as possible from the technological revolution that is proceeding from America. Certainly it would be unpleasant for the Kremlin rulers to have to experience a rapid resurgence of the "capitalistic" countries in their immediate proximity. Furthermore, the hope of being able to utilize economic and social crises as a fertile ground for "the class struggle" would have to be given up once again.

In an essay in EUROPAARCHIV 1984 entitled "The Use of Space as a Potential Source of Political Conflict," Stephan Freiherr von Welck established at the

outset: "Unlike the continents and the oceans of earth, the Cosmos is an unlimited, infinite space. In order to be able to grasp its dimensions, one should recall that Earth is nothing other than a small planet of a mid-sized star which we call the Sun, on the edge of a Milky Way consisting of more than 100 billion stars." Therefore only space that is close to Earth can be utilized.

Simply because of this fact it is clear that notions such as "Star Wars" or a slogan coined recently by the Soviet foreign minister, "Star Peace," should be banned as misleading.

It is a similar case with the designation "militarization of space." We already know that it can only be a question of that part of space which lies closest to Earth. And this militarization will not be initiated by the SDI project: it has been underway for some time now. If one overlooks the use of space close to Earth by the German V-2 weapons in World War II, one must observe--despite and within the framework of the Space Treaty--that above all the Soviet Union and the USA, but also Great Britain, France and China, possess many thousands of intercontinental and mid-range missiles which must be regarded as potential space invaders.

Moreover, one must not overlook the use of space through the escalating implementation of military satellites. Between 1957 and the end of 1981, the Soviet Union and the United States together launched 1,917 satellites for military purposes. This corresponds to 75 percent of all of the man-made earth satellites launched into orbit during the period cited.

It is true that it is not always easy to distinguish between satellites with civilian or military objectives. In addition to multi-purpose utility, there are also substitution possibilities which are obvious for communications, weather, navigation and earth observation satellites.

In the five years between 1978 and 1983, the Soviet Union launched 450 military satellites, the USA 90. From this alone it is clear that the Soviet "anti-militarization campaign against the arming of space" is inspired by the motto: "Stop the thief!"

Technological advances and economic growth, as developments in this century have shown us, only come about when in a free and market-oriented, self-confident nation priorities are set and supported with objective-oriented state and private funding.

Sputnik Shock

These insights can be most clearly demonstrated using the example of the US Apollo program. We remember the technological and strategic shock that the Americans experienced when in 1957 the Soviet Union succeeded in launching a man-made satellite into earth orbit. Even though Sputnik was only a beeping space vehicle, equipped with a radio device, which impressed people around the

world who enthusiastically welcomed the new technology, this event gave rise to serious reflections on the part of those responsible for security policy in the USA.

The USA, invulnerable to attack because of two unbridgeable oceans, suddenly saw itself subject to the danger of being physically threatened within 25-30 minutes--the length of time it takes a nuclear warhead to reach North America from Siberia.

Who does not remember Kennedy's speech when he announced that an American would be the first to reach the moon, and that this would happen before 1970? In 1969, this stage had finally been reached. This prestigious project had obviously been initiated not only to prove which nation could develop the most sophisticated technologies. The resulting military and strategic benefits are quite evident even today.

Much more was involved than simply developing delivery systems and rockets with sufficient propulsion. Guidance systems and computer systems especially were perfected at an extremely rapid pace.

Especially with this project, one should not overlook the "spin-off" effects. From microprocessors to digital clocks, from modern communications systems to household appliances, from optronics to multi-spectral observation methods and to sensor technology, all of these civilian applications led to a creation of value throughout the entire economy, in which each dollar that had originally been invested led to beneficial investments of 10 dollars in other sectors of the economy.

Radiation Technology

But now a few more concrete comments regarding radiation technology. According to American statistics, research costs that are financed by the Administration amount to \$26 billion. In addition, about \$50 billion is said to flow from university and industrial research funding.

And these amounts are said to be made available for a project that is allegedly not feasible because of physical principles--as SDI opponents claim, and as we recently read in a comment by Dr. Bruno Kreisky?

Even if one doubted the statements of American experts, who claim that the Soviet Union is ahead in radiation technology in terms of research and perhaps even in terms of testing, the massive propaganda effort of the Kremlin against the American SDI program can be regarded as indirect proof its feasibility.

"The utilization of the Cosmos," in the words of Stephan Freiherr von Welck, "today has already become a commercial undertaking." This claim becomes clearest in the area of communications satellites. More than 60 percent of all non-military satellites fall into this category. They carry some 70 percent of all intercontinental telephone conversations, telegrams and radio and television broadcasts. But they also find applications within countries with a large surface area. While according to Welck in 1965 the annual

leasing fee for a long-distance telephone line via Intelsat I cost \$32,000, in 1983 only \$5,000 had to be paid for the same line.

Space transportation is also likely to develop into a commercial undertaking. In this context--above all because of the decreasing costs of transportation because of the Space Shuttle--the manufacture of satellites has become a not unessential economic factor. Each year 400 tons of satellite mass are launched into earth orbit. The market value per kilogram of satellite mass amounts to 750,000 Austrian schillings. Compared with a market value in kg for airplanes of 7,000 schillings or for television sets of 700 shillings, this means an annual production value for satellites of approximately 300 billion Austrian schillings.

It can be predicted with caution that in this area of civilian utilization, great advances are likely to be made both in remote observations as well as in the manufacture of biotechnological and pharmaceutical products and new substances and materials. Other studies indicate that the decisive impact of the application of research results in the areas of laser, plasma and particle physics will consist of a push forward in important industrial processes and production sectors, which should make it possible to increase production across the entire economy.

Eureka, the European mini-edition of the space and radiation research project, remains the hope of many business circles. This project, which was initiated by France, also seems to be the magic formula of our own politicians. It is obvious that we should also participate in this project--to the extent that an opportunity is presented to us. Anyone familiar with the ambitious French armament policy, however, should not be taken in by the illusion that this involves--as we are assured by responsible officials in our own state--purely civilian research.

What has already been established as true for SDI also holds true for Eureka: it is impossible to undertake a strict division. Budgetary appropriations, however, point to a smaller research capacity and therefore to a longer time commitment. Since French policy rejects cooperation with the US, for some time now productive French companies have been negotiating joint ventures with American partners.

12792
CSO: 5200/2681

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

NORWAY'S DEFENSE MINISTER DEFENDS WUERBURG SDI STATEMENT

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 25 Mar 86 p 3

[Article by Alf Seeland]

[Text] "As far as I can see, this is a lot of excitement without reason," Defense Minister C. Sjaastad tells AFTENPOSTEN following the demand made during the last few days from some political quarters for his resignation. "The communique from the NATO meeting in Wuerzburg contains only things on which there was agreement all the time: All areas are negotiation themes, and the Allies as well as the Soviet Union will be consulted before SDI leaves the research stage and it becomes a question of deployment."

The minister, who is at present on Easter vacation, emphasizes strongly that all the defense ministers of NATO were unanimous on issuing the communique from Wuerzburg and that Norway has given its support to the position which was presented already early last year during the meeting between Foreign Ministers Schulz and Gromyko as an introduction to the present negotiations in Geneva and which has subsequently been supported by the entire Western Alliance. Sjaastad establishes that neither previously nor at the most recent meeting of defense ministers was any general authority given by the Allies to the United States to go all the way with the space arms program. "The restrictive view has been taken that both the Allies and the Soviet Union will have to be consulted before the program leaves the stage of research and it may become a question of deployment."

Against this background, Defense Minister Sjaastad cannot understand the waves which have been created in a few newspapers and among a few politicians in this country, and he does not hesitate to describe it as a lot of excitement without reason when it is hinted that he may encounter a vote of censure in parliament because of the claim that he would have gone beyond what has hitherto been the position of the government and parliament on SDI. Sjaastad denies categorically that he would have supported any proposal at Wuerzburg representing something new in the policy pursued by the Alliance or Norway.

Under the heading "Sjaasted Kicked by the Stars," VERDENS GANG has put a question to Knut Frydenlund, who is the chief spokesman of the Labor Party in foreign policy matters. "If it is true that Defense Minister Sjaastad would have given his support without reservations to the American Star Wars Program, SDI, this will necessarily have consequences," says Frydenlund, pointing out that in a letter to parliament on the matter, the government has dissociated itself from an arms race in space, and that it dissociated itself from using large resources in this area.

Frydenlund is supported by the chairman of the Socialist-Left Party, Theo Koritzinsky, who states that he is almost impressed with Sjaastad's parliamentary courage or foolhardiness. If the reports from Wuerzburg are correct, Defense Minister Sjaastad has acted contrary to the majority of parliament. Sjaastad may encounter a vote of censure right after Easter, Koritzinsky says.

"This is confusing," Johan Buttedahl, parliamentary leader of the Center Party, admits. "I do not quite understand what has happened, but I expect to be informed if that which Sjaastad has participated in involves a change in that which must be Norway's official policy."

His fellow party member, Lars Velsand, tells VERDENS GANG that he will prefer to see the final communique from the NATO meeting in writing, assuming for the time being that Sjaastad has advanced the viewpoints to which parliament has previously given its support.

7262
CSO: 5200/2670

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

NORWEGIAN LABOR CONFEDERATION SUPPORTS SOVIET SDI DEMANDS

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 23 Apr 86 p 5

[Article: "LO Support for Soviet Demand"]

[Text] The Soviet Union's demand that the United States give up the space weapon program (SDI) as a condition for Soviet reduction of strategic nuclear weapons has broad support in the Norwegian union movement.

At a union seminar about space weapons on Tuesday, arranged by 18 union leaders, there were strong doubts expressed about the willingness to negotiate of the American President and the circles around him.

Several delegates expressed fear of a development in which the American space weapon research is entering a gray zone between research and testing of the weapons which are the goal of the research. Such a development could force the Soviet Union to respond with a rapid buildup of its strategic nuclear weapon arsenal with the result that the United States is forced to do the same.

Kaare Sandegren, chief of the LO [Trade Union Confederation] International Office, was among those who feared that the entire disarmament process is now in danger. Sandegren also said that the Soviet Union has said that it is willing to accept verification of its own disarmament measures. "The offer is believable, even though the Soviets have their own questionable dealings," he said.

After a thorough review of the Willoch government's handling of SDI, Knut Frydenlund said that there has been a movement away from the Storting's assumption about prohibition of such weapons in space to suggestions of limited deployment.

"Within a short time the Storting will have reason to put a stop to this movement. It is necessary," said Frydenlund.

In a roll call the union members demanded action against space weapons calling on the Storting to pass a resolution that Norwegian industry and Norwegian research institutions will not participate in projects "connected with the American SDI program or financed by it."

9287
CSO:5200/2679

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

NHK INTERVIEWS NAKASONE ON PREPARATIONS FOR SUMMIT

OW260200 Tokyo NHK Television Network in Japanese 1300 GMT 25 Apr 86

[Interview with Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone by NHK newscaster Taro Kimura and Sophia University Associate Professor Kuniko Inokuchi, entitled "The Tokyo Summit and Japan" on 25 April at the Prime Minister's official residence-- recorded]

[Excerpts] [Kimura] It is finally time for the summit; we are feeling the intensified atmosphere for it -- or rather the increasingly tight security around us. In fact, we had our credentials checked on our way here today. Would you first comment on the progress in the summit preparations? Are they almost...?

[Nakasone, interrupting] Let me put it this way -- we are now in the midst of preparing for it with everything we have. Well, among other things, those radicals are doing various things and in that connection, we feel very sorry for residents in Tokyo and all our fellow citizens for the troubles the radicals caused. We are working hard to minimize such things as the restrictions imposed for security reasons. However, the guests we are going to have in this country are presidents and prime ministers; it would have a bearing on the honor of Japan should there be any incident at all. With that in mind, we are placing greater emphasis on security measures. I would like to ask Tokyo residents and all my fellow citizens to bear with us for some more time -- it won't be too long.

[Kimura] You must be ready with a number of topics that will be discussed at the summit which will be held in a situation that appears to be very turbulent internationally. With regard to the Japan-U.S. summit which you held with President Reagan recently, what was your feeling about the U.S. attitude toward the Tokyo Summit? After all, the United States will be playing the leading role....

[Nakasone] The world economy has come to a point of major change and in the case of Japan, mid-and small-sized businesses are experiencing tremendous difficulties because of the yen's appreciation. At the same time, the decline in oil prices put the oil producing countries in a plight, and the falling prices of primary products also dealt a blow to developing nations. In view of these developments, I suggested to President Reagan that we endeavor to make the Tokyo Summit an occasion to give hope to the world. The President expressed his total agreement and promised full cooperation. At the press conference held in the White House, the resident again promised his cooperation with making the Tokyo Summit one full of hopes.

Preparations are progressing smoothly. Presidents and prime ministers of the world's major nations are coming to Tokyo, and the most important issue for them to discuss will be that of peace and disarmament. It is our earnest hope that a second Reagan-Gorbachev meeting will materialize to bring peace and reassurance to the world; it is hoped that we will give President Reagan our strong support and push the situation toward that end.

In addition to the peace and disarmament issue, we will discuss ways and means to resolve the current abnormality in the world economy. While each country is doing what it should do, it must at the same time think about the world as a whole -- what it can do for the world's prosperity. Determining the future course to that end -- that is another thing for the summit to do. I believe.

There is also the problem of terrorism. We should see that resolute measures are taken through international cooperation to wipe it out. Efforts by individual countries are not enough. The past summit meetings took up this issue repeatedly and issued statements about it. I believe that international cooperation should further be strengthened against terrorism. I also believe that we should issue a strong appeal to those engaged in terrorist activities, calling on them to quit.

[Kimura] Among the tasks facing the summit, I believe, is dealing with the yen appreciation issue. The Japanese people are concerned that the value of the yen continues to surge. Mr Shultz said this morning that the present trend reflects the market forces at work and that the United States will not intervene. What is your view, Mr Prime Minister? How far do you think it will go?

[Nakasone] I cannot give you any figures on that -- it is inconceivable that I would have such figures in the first place. One thing I can say, however, is that the trend is too sharp, making it impossible to adequately respond to it. Therefore, we must take some countermeasures to deal with such precipitous fluctuations. While there are various ways to deal with them, it is, generally speaking, desirable to get the exchange rate to stabilize at a certain level and to stay there as long as possible. Furthermore, the level should be an appropriate one -- that is, a level reflecting the real strength of the economies. This issue will probably come up at the Tokyo summit, too. We also want to raise it ourselves. In Japan, mid-and small-sized and even some major businesses are having serious problems now, and many of them are left unable to find a way out. We are planning to take emergency measures in all areas -- measures to stimulate domestic demand as well as fiscal and financial programs. As a long-term program, we are also planning to carry out tax cuts. As the LDP announced yesterday, we have a bold tax cut plan for salaried workers of the 4 million-8 million yen income bracket. In the corporate tax area, too, the LDP plan calls for a cut to a 40 percent level.

[Inokuchi] In terms of a time span, how long do you think will it take for the exchange rate to stabilize?

[Nakasone] It all depends on the world situation. There are so many factors, including oil prices; it is impossible to make a prediction about it. All I can say now is that it will stabilize at some level at some time.

[Kimura] With regard to the trade issue, other countries first had asked Japan to open up its markets. These days, however, they are demanding that we increase our domestic demand. Is there any effective way to satisfy them?

[Nakasone] On 8 April we announced a very significant program, including reductions in utility and natural gas bills to pass on benefits from the oil price decline and the yen's appreciation to consumers. The reductions amount to approximately 1 trillion yen; equivalent to a 1 trillion yen tax cut. Utility fees for the consumers are being reduced this much, and industrial electricity costs are also going down that much. As the oil prices decline, motorists are now paying approximately 10 yen less per liter of gasoline. Under the present circumstances, the price will go down further. Therefore, it should be noted that the yen's appreciation has its merits. As for the price index, it is about 8 percent below the level of this time last year, according to a report I received today. The figure was 6 percent last month. This is a good thing for salaried workers -- and senior citizens, too. Interest rates are also coming down. This is good news for business; they can borrow money from banks at lower interest rates now.

My point is that the new trends in the rates have their merits; nevertheless, excesses are not good because they will cause demand to diminish. It is therefore important for the rates to find an appropriate level and stabilize there. Currently, they are in the process of adjustment. We are endeavoring to get them to stabilize at an appropriate level and asking our citizens for some more time in this area. We are also asking other countries for some more time, telling them that the yen's surge is too great to cope with. The yen has appreciated as much as 10 yen in 1 week, making it simply impossible for export industries to cope. They cannot even carry out their cost accounting. We already laid down the course of action, and we are now working hard along that course. All we are asking for is time.

[Kimura] While economic issues are, needless to say, important, Mr Reagan appears to be eagerly looking forward to a discussion of terrorism at the Tokyo summit. He seems to be willing for some resolute measures to be taken against terrorism. On the other hand, however, Europeans do not necessarily appear to be in tune with him. As the prime minister of the host country, might you not find your job a difficult one in arranging for harmony between them?

[Nakasone] European nations are united on one point -- that is, that international terrorism must be dealt with through cooperation. The question is what specific measures we can come up with to promote cooperation on that basis. That will be the key issue, and I assure you that I will see to it that there is an accord. Terrorism is unjustifiable under any circumstances. It is very important that this new type of international crime is dealt with through international cooperation.

[Kimura]. In the aftermath of the U.S. air raid on Libya, we first thought U.S.-USSR dialogue might come to a halt. Unexpectedly, however, Mr Gorbachev's response was not as tough as we had thought it would be. The possibility of a second U.S.-USSR summit still remains more or less alive. This question -- a question relating to East-West relations -- is certain to be raised at the Tokyo summit, I believe, and in that connection, what is your view of the possibility?

[Nakasone] I do not think there is no hope. Rather, I think there is great hope. The nuclear arms stockpiled by the United States and the Soviet Union are so massive that they are beginning to feel the burden is almost unbearable. This is the situation in which they find themselves today. As I said, it applies to the Soviet Union, too. The Soviet Union has been depending on oil for needed foreign exchange. As a result of the drastic fall in oil prices, its deficit has reached an \$8 billion level, according to some intelligence reports. It might try to sell its gold in foreign markets only to find that it still cannot acquire the required foreign exchange, because the price of gold has fallen so drastically.

More important is the fact that nuclear weapons must be scrapped for the sake of peace for mankind. As far as this fundamental perception is concerned, there is no difference between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, I believe. Strategic and tactical interests led them to their present confrontation; the military and bureaucrats under them are unable to free themselves from the things of the past. But as far as the two leaders are concerned, they are anxious to carry their cause out. Therefore it is necessary that they break the fetters with the military and bureaucrats and push ahead with their cause courageously.

When Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze visited Japan, I asked him to convey this message from me to Mr Gorbachev: Please do not listen to the military or bureaucrats. I told Mr Shevardnadze that I had been saying the same thing to Mr Reagan, too. This precisely is the wisdom that politicians should exercise. There is a time for them to make up their minds and act.

[Inokuchi] The arms race between the United States and the USSR is, in one aspect, shifting its emphasis from a quantitative area to a qualitative area, with greater attention paid to technological developments. This has prompted some people to express their concern over the possibility that Japan, a nation seeking to survive by technology, is being caught up in it. What is your view of this point, Mr Prime Minister?

[Nakasone] It is a matter of how we see the relationship between technology and defense. Our view is that there should be a clear-cut separation between them where needed while there should be collaboration between them wherever necessary. What you have in your mind could be the SDI issue.

What is called SDI is, according to the report by our mission which returned from the United States recently, a new weapons system that opens the way to ending nuclear weapons. I think that developing such a system is one way of abolishing nuclear weapons. Mr Reagan is trying to create such a system. He is saying that when it becomes available, he will show it to the Soviet Union and tell them to have the same thing. When both sides have it, they will eventually dismantle their nuclear weapons.

The SDI is thus dedicated to an ideal. What we are saying is that we understand the concept behind it — that is, the concept of abolishing nuclear weapons. Whether we participate in it or not will be determined after a study of the mission's report. Meanwhile, France and other European countries are showing different responses to this issue; however, they have one thing in common — namely, they allow the private sector to participate in it.

[Kimura] I believe that you are fully conscious of the fact that the Tokyo Summit is one held in Asia. Would you comment on what this means?

[Nakasone] I would like to see it prove to be a summit that serves the interests of developing nations, debtor nations, and underdeveloped nations. I have been saying that there can be no prosperity of the North without the prosperity of the South, because industrial countries of the North depend on the raw materials from the South for their prosperity and because unless countries of the South achieve prosperity, countries of the North cannot sell them their products. Thus, the world is moving in a great cycle. If this great cycle should come to a halt, the world will suffer and both the North and the South will have problems. It is our obligation to see to it that this great cyclic movement of the world functions properly. The North must not seek prosperity by itself. We must look after developing and debtor nations so that all can live in a world with

bright prospects. Advanced nations should invest as much money as possible in international organizations such as IMF, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the African Development Bank, and the development banks in the United States to help developing nations develop faster and to help relieve debtor nations of their burden. I would like to see some significant progress made in that direction.

Another thing is that we must fight protectionism. The U.S. Congress is watching for a chance to consider the so-called Omnibus legislation. As you know, they are having elections in the fall. Should protectionist legislation be passed and a 20 percent surcharge imposed, imports from Japan would virtually come to a halt. Japan would then be full of unemployed people. It is to prevent protectionist legislation from being introduced in the Congress that I am making such painstaking efforts as you see; it is precisely for that reason that I endeavor to remain on good terms with President Reagan.

In order to prevent such protectionist bills from being passed by the U.S. Congress, we must cooperate with European countries and developing nations, too. Through cooperation, we must support President Reagan's position against protectionism. This is an important thing. Meanwhile, we are planning to hold a new round of GATT to promote free trade. A ministerial conference on a global scale will be held in September to work out arrangements for it. Mr Chiba of Japan is serving as chairman of the body in charge of this project. Japan has come a long way indeed, has it not?

I would like to see the Tokyo Summit play a significant role in promoting the current work for the new round. Unless we look after the developing countries and debtor nations, they will not cooperate with the new round either. That is why I am trying to make the Tokyo Summit a summit for everyone.

[Kimura] Well, we now see an increasing number of posters on display in the streets....

[Nakasone] I have been saying for some time now that I am not thinking about dissolving the House of Representatives. I repeat that I am not thinking about dissolving it.

[Kimura] Do you mean that you will be concentrating on the summit for now?

[Nakasone] That is right.

[Inokuchi] Structurally speaking, the world revolves around the two superpowers -- the United States and the USSR. Nevertheless, Japan has this precious opportunity to serve as a host nation for the summit. It is our hope that you will successfully display your leadership and at the same time show your strength as a coordinator. I am wishing you success.

[Nakasone] I sent envoys to the ROK, China, Southeast Asian countries, India, and Australia to find out what they wanted to be brought up at the Tokyo summit. On their return, those envoys reported back to me on their findings. I am planning to have the wishes of Asian nations and our neighboring countries reflected in the summit. At the same time, I will try to make it an occasion for the chiefs of state and prime ministers of the summit nations to refresh their views on or open their eyes to Japan, the Japanese culture, and the Japanese way of life. I am planning to fly many koinobori [carp streamers] and display many gogatsu ningyo [dolls for the boys' festival].

[Kimura] Thank you very much for being with us today despite your busy schedule.

/8309

CSO: 5260/082

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

EXPERTS MISSION RECOMMENDS PARTICIPATION IN SDI RESEARCH

OW230117 Tokyo KYODO in English 0103 GMT 23 Apr 86

[Text] Tokyo, April 23 KYODO -- A group of senior government officials and private sector engineers on Wednesday submitted to the government a report recommending Japan's participation in the research phase of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). The report, summarizing the findings of a 55-member SDI mission to the United States March 31 - April 8, was submitted during a special closed-door meeting of five key Cabinet ministers.

Makoto Watanabe, deputy director general of the Foreign Ministry's North American Affairs Bureau who led the mission, explained what a ministry official called "an executive summary" of the mission's findings. Attending the meeting were Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe, International Trade and Industry Minister Michio Watanabe, Defense Agency Director General Koichi Kato, Science and Technology Agency Director General Yohei Kono and Chief Cabinet Secretary Masaharu Gotoda.

The summary represented a new step toward Japan's eventual participation in the anti-missile space-based defense program, known as "star wars," although Foreign Ministry officials insisted the report covered only the program's technical aspects and did not cover its political and strategic implications.

A Foreign Ministry official said a more detailed report is being prepared with figures and other data, including classified information the United States has strongly requested Japan not to leak to the Eastern Bloc or other third countries. "But the upcoming report's essence is here," the official said, referring to the eight-page report submitted to the government of Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, who has told the administration of U.S. President Ronald Reagan that his government "understands" the SDI research.

The brief report prepared by Watanabe, eight other government officials and 46 experts from 21 leading Japanese companies after their U.S. trip, hinted at "the possibility of a big impact (of Japan's participation in the SDI research) on improving our country's related technology standards."

The participating Japanese firms included Ishikawajima-Harima Heavy Industries, Kobe Steel, Sony, NEC, Nissan Motor, Toray and Toshiba.

Members of the mission visited the Pentagon, the Los Alamos National Laboratory, the U.S. Army's Strategic Defense Command, Lockheed Missiles and Space Corp. and 10 other places across the U.S. between March 31 and April 8. The report acknowledged that

Japan still lags behind the United States in many SDI research-related fields. But it emphasized Japan's superiority in "electronics and other component technology fields" and predicted "significant technological spin-offs in related technologies in Japan" should the country join in the SDI research.

The mission traveled in three groups, depending on their fields of concern — directed energy weapons (DEW), kinetic energy weapons (KEW) and surveillance acquisition tracking kill-assessment (SATKA). Japan dispatched the delegation to follow up two previous missions made up exclusively of government officials September 30-October 1 and January 15-22 in response to Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger's invitation of March 1985 to participate in the research phase of the SDI.

The latest mission, the "executive summary" said, "significantly clarified the overall picture of the SDI research's technical aspect." While pointing to the need for a further improvement in existing technological standards to achieve the SDI research's stated purposes, the report noted "a steady progress in the United States" toward that end.

Britain and West Germany have reached agreement with the United States on their participation in the SDI research for which the U.S. Government is seeking an appropriation of 26 billion dollars over a five-year period.

Amid growing indications that Japan will eventually take part in the SDI research, some government officials and opposition parties argue that Japanese participation runs counter to a 1969 parliamentary resolution limiting development and utilization of space to peaceful purposes.

In a meeting with Abe in Tokyo in January, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze warned Japan against joining in the U.S. scheme, which is designed to counter a Soviet military buildup. U.S. Government officials have contended that the Soviets are conducting a similar space-based anti-missile program.

The SDI issue will be one of the key political topics for discussion during the forthcoming summit of the seven biggest industrial democracies and the European Community in Tokyo May 4-6, Japanese officials predicted.

/9274
CSO: 5260/080

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SCIENTISTS TAKE PART IN ANTI-SDI CAMPAIGN

OW270741 Tokyo KYODO in English 0713 GMT 27 Apr 86

[Text] Tokyo, 27 April KYODO--The latest report by a government study panel hints Japan may participate in the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI) research plan--and Japanese scientists are concerned. In a move aimed at blocking a "trend to militarize scientific research," two groups representing the interests of Japanese physicists and mathematicians have joined forces in organizing a signature-gathering campaign among colleagues across the country.

To date, some 2,000 physicists in 145 universities or research institutes have affixed their signatures to the "statement against SDI," and the numbers are growing. A total of 700 mathematicians, whose expertise in computer-related research would form one aspect of SDI study, have added their names to call on the Japanese Government not to participate in the U.S. program. Moreover, to press the point even further, individual researchers are sending notices of protest directly to the office of Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone.

According to physicists involved in the movement, the SDI project could trigger an arms race in space and thus increase the danger of nuclear war. If the Japanese Government does decide to take part, physicists, engineers and mathematicians working in such areas as laser physics, accelerator physics, computer sciences and photo engineering will find their research directed into SDI-related programs, protest group members pointed out in their statement. As a result, they added, research material for publication would be restricted to "protect military secrets" and scientists would lose freedom while conducting research.

At a recent meeting of the Science Council of Japan, council committee members in charge of problems related to peace announced they were "concerned over recent developments related to SDI participation." Committee head Tadashi Kawada, a Sophia University professor, pointed out, "the issue isn't limited to just physicists and mathematicians. Scholars in the fields of social sciences and humanities should also be thinking about the problems related to SDI."

Although the anti-SDI signature campaign is gathering momentum in the regional academic and research centers of Sendai, Nagoya and Tsukuba Science City in Ibaraki Prefecture, recent reports indicate Japan is coming round to accepting U.S. call for participation in SDI research.

On 23 April, a government-business panel announced that Japan's participation in SDI research would favorably influence the advance of related technology in the country.

But Shoji Sawada, representative for physicists against SDI, warned, "The group has only been discussing how Japan will profit from participation in the SDI program. They're ignoring the Diet resolution that space development must be limited to peaceful goals and are planning instead to drastically alter Japan's research structure."

/12232
CSO: 5260/085

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S ZAGLADIN COMMENTS ON REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING IN GENEVA

Moscow AGITATOR in Russian No 2, Feb 86 pp 37-42

[V. Zagladin, first deputy chief, International Department of the CPSU Central Committee: "A Most Important Event"]

[Excerpts] This is precisely how the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee characterized the meeting of Comrade M. S. Gorbachev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with the U.S. President, Ronald Reagan, which took place in Geneva during 19-21 November 1985. The fact that the animated discussion of its results has continued up to now and that in all corners of the planet the wishes and demands for the realization of the agreements reached in Geneva are increasing eloquently confirms the correctness of this assessment.

The Soviet leadership took into account: The USSR and the United States are the greatest and strongest powers in military terms. But in contrast to the American administration, which takes the view that the power of the United States gives it some sort of special rights, right up to the right to "world leadership", the Soviet Union is convinced: The might of the two powers does not give them any special rights, but on the other hand imposes upon them a special responsibility for the state of world affairs, above all for the solution of the problem of war and peace. And precisely this range of problems--the key problems of our time--was set for discussion with President R. Reagan. "We must discuss," comrade M. S. Gorbachev said in his interview with *TIME* magazine, "not myths and stereotypes, which already have become rather boring, but the real problems and the real interests of our countries, our future, and the future of the entire world community."

"We advocate regular, correct, if you will, civilized inter-state relations based on the genuine respect of the norms of international law," it was noted at the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. "But it must be utmost clear: Only when imperialism repudiates its attempts to solve, by military means, the historic controversy between the two social systems, will it be possible to bring international relations into the channel of normal cooperation."

The April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, taking into account all aspects of the situation that had developed, sought to activize Soviet foreign

policy in every conceivable manner, including in the direction of the improvement of relations with the United States, it goes without saying, without encroaching on the legitimate rights and interests of each other. The Plenum warned: The plans being brought forth in Washington to attain superiority over the USSR in military terms are hopeless. But on the other hand, if the policy of the administration would be corrected in the proper manner, this would open up the way for mutually acceptable agreements. On our part, the Plenum emphasized, such readiness is present.

And from the moment when the agreement was reached on the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva, the Soviet Union began active preparation for its conduct.

At the negotiations on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, the USSR came forward with a number of proposals, proposals that were concrete and radical.

First of all, it was proposed to prohibit space strike weapons. It was proposed because the beginning of the arms race in space and even the deployment, in earth-surrounding space, of anti-missile systems alone will not strengthen anyone's security. Concealed by the cosmic "shield", nuclear weapons of attack will become still more dangerous.

The appearance of space-based strike weapons could turn the present strategic balance into strategic chaos, call forth a feverish arms race in all directions, and undermine one of the most important foundations of its limitation--the agreement on missile defense. As a result, the distrust among the countries would increase, and security would decrease significantly.

Further. With the complete prohibition of space-based strike weapons, it was proposed to reduce by half all nuclear weapons available to the USSR and the United States that are capable of reaching each other's territory, and to limit the total number of nuclear warheads on them for each of the two sides with a ceiling of 6,000 units. These are radical reductions, measured in thousands of nuclear weapons.

Such an approach is fair. It encompasses all the weapons which form the strategic correlation of forces and makes it possible to take into account the nuclear threat practically existing for each side, irrespective of by whom or from where nuclear weapons are delivered to their territory--by missile or aircraft, from its territory or from the territory of allies.

The reduction by half of the nuclear weapons of the USSR and the United States is viewed by our country as a beginning. The Soviet Union is prepared to go even further--up to the complete destruction of nuclear weapons--with the participation, it goes without saying, of the other nuclear states.

It is natural that the nuclear arms race is calling forth special anxiety among the European nations. Europe is over-saturated with nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union stands for the complete removal of nuclear weapons from Europe--both medium-range and tactical. However, the United States and its NATO partners do not go for this. Taking this into account, the Soviet leadership pro-

posed to begin, as it were, with intermediate solutions, and then to plead the case for further reductions. These proposals meet the hopes of the European nations to weaken the nuclear threat and to strengthen the security of Europe.

The fundamental aspect of the matter should be emphasized: In three directions of the negotiations--with respect to space, strategic offensive weapons, and medium-range nuclear weapons--the USSR has proposed nothing to the United States that would decrease its security.

In April the Soviet Union unilaterally introduced a moratorium on the placement of medium-range missiles in its European zone, and then reduced the number of such missiles on military duty to the level that existed at the beginning of June 1984 (when we began to implement our own measures as a response to the stationing of American missiles in Western Europe). The USSR introduced unilaterally a moratorium also for nuclear explosions of any type. In both cases, it was proposed to the United States to join our moratoria.

Simultaneously during the summer and fall, Soviet-American consultations were held on a number of international problems (above all, on so-called regional conflicts), as well as on questions of bilateral relations. And although they did not produce appreciable practical results, nevertheless this was an element of no small importance in expanding the dialogue between the countries.

In short, at the beginning of the meeting, the Soviet side came with serious, weighty baggage--with baggage of concrete ideas and proposals, which in no way infringed upon the legitimate interests of the United States and its security. On the contrary, if these proposals would have been implemented, the security of the United States and general security would have become much stronger.

It is well known that the American side reacted extremely peculiarly to our steps. It at once rejected the main point of our proposals--concerning the non-militarization of space. Moreover, exactly on the threshold of the meeting the next tests of space weapons were conducted, as well as new nuclear explosions. Certain political forces in Washington developed an active campaign against any agreement whatever with the USSR on the limitation and reduction of weapons. The influential (and close to the White House) organization "Heritage Fund" called for the conduct of an openly anti-Soviet policy and for the attainment of nothing less than the displacement of our country from international politics.

There were quite a few attacks on our country. And nevertheless the Soviet leadership decided in favor of the meeting with the President of the United States. The decision was taken because our country did not think it had the right to disregard even the smallest chance to restrain the dangerous development in the world. It was taken, recognizing that if it will not prove possible to start a direct discussion now, then it would be much more difficult later, and perhaps too late.

The Geneva negotiations were unusual, pointed, and at times outspoken. The American side obstinately defended its "strategic defense initiative" and tried to show that it will all but lead to an improvement of the situation and to the

elimination of nuclear weapons. The Soviet side showed the complete unsoundness of such assertions. Indeed, to judge from the pronouncements and declarations of American officials, the issue--after having combined offensive nuclear and space weapons--is the attainment of superiority over the USSR.

Comrade M. S. Gorbachev emphasized that he is not given to the implementation of plans of that sort. The USSR will not permit superiority over itself and its allies. At the same time, it is not aspiring to superiority over the United States, if only because such a situation would increase the suspicion of the other side and would increase the instability of the strategic situation. "Life turns out in such a way," the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee noted, "that both of our countries will have to get used to strategic parity as the natural state. We will have to move toward a joint understanding of what level of armaments for each of the sides can be considered as relatively sufficient from the standpoint of its reliable defense." Moreover, it goes without saying, this level must be significantly lower than the existing level. And so we must strive for the implementation of measures regarding the reduction of arms.

Along with problems of arms reduction, other international questions were also discussed at the meeting. Here in many cases important disagreements of the sides on the very approach to their examination also came to light. The essence of the disagreements consisted in how to approach the assessment of important processes of world development and the relations with other states. The United States, as before, proceeds from an imperial approach. It assesses any social or national movement of peoples as contradicting the interests of the United States, touching on its "vital interests". Such an approach is profoundly unrealistic. In point of fact, it denies the right of the majority of nations to think independently and to solve their problems. The Soviet side clearly said: The USSR is for the recognition of the inalienable right of every people to freedom, independence, and the independent choice of its developmental path, for the fact that this right is not trampled on by anyone, that there are no attempts to interfere from the outside. The Soviet has been and will be on the side of the peoples defending their independence.

What results have the Geneva negotiations produced?

It is natural that even today, after these negotiations, the USSR and the United States continue to have important disagreements on questions of fundamental importance. In Geneva it did not prove possible to arrive at concrete agreements on real disarmament and, above all, on the central problem of nuclear and space weapons. There was no reduction of the number of weapons by both sides after the meeting. This cannot but call forth disappointment.

At the same time, it would be incorrect to minimize the significance of the meeting and the agreements reached there. "The dialogue of the supreme leaders," comrade M. S. Gorbachev emphasized at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, "is always a moment of truth in the relations between states. It is important that such a dialogue took place--during the current difficult times, it in itself is a stabilizing factor."

The agreements reached in Geneva, although, as has already been said, they do not relate to the main question, nevertheless are of great significance. What are we talking about?

First of all, about the common understanding, set forth in the joint declaration, that nuclear war must never be unleashed, that there cannot be victors in it, and that it is the duty of the USSR and the United States to build their relations proceeding from this indisputable truth and not to strive for military superiority.

Recorded jointly and at the summit level, this understanding must in fact be placed at the basis of the foreign policy of the two states. If it is recognized that nuclear war, by its very nature, cannot have any rational goals whatsoever, then the stronger will be the stimulus in favor of its prevention, the reduction of the developments and tests of the means of mass destruction, and the complete elimination of the accumulated stocks of nuclear weapons. And, indeed, the more inadmissible to open up new directions for an arms race.

Secondly, the USSR and the United States clearly confirmed their obligation to promote every conceivable increase in the effectiveness of the measures for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and agreed on joint practical steps in this direction. In the uneasy international situation of today, this is of no small significance for the maintenance of stability in the world and the reduction of the risk of the development of nuclear wars.

Thirdly, the joint stand of the leaders of the two countries for the general and complete prohibition and destruction of such barbarous weapons of mass destruction as chemical weapons is of fundamental significance.

Fourthly, the agreement of the leadership of the USSR and the United States, together with other states participating in the Stockholm Conference, to promote its most rapid completion with the adoption of a document that would include concrete obligations concerning the non-use of force, as well as mutually acceptable measures for strengthening confidence.

Fifthly, a number of useful agreements appeared in regard to many directions of the development of bilateral cooperation between the USSR and the United States. They can serve as a good basis for increasing the level of confidence between our countries and peoples--if, needless to say, a careful attitude is taken toward what has been elaborated and everything good is developed that is embodied in it, and no artificial grounds are sought to overturn them.

We must speak separately about the significance of the agreement reached in Geneva on the continuation of the political contacts between the Soviet Union and the United States, including new meetings at the summit level.

Thus, it will be correct to say that the overall balance of the Geneva negotiations is positive. ". . . The results of the negotiations in Geneva," the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee noted, "are capable of exerting a positive influence on the change in the political and psychological climate in contemporary international relations and their normalization and reducing the threat of the beginning of nuclear war."

The results of the meeting confirmed the correctness of the foreign policy of our country and the validity of its basic points of reference. Also confirmed was the fruitfulness of the initiatives that were realized by our country during the past few months. It was precisely these steps which paved the way for Geneva and made it possible for the Soviet leadership, being based on a reliable foundation, to defend the interests of peace with confidence.

It goes without saying, the long-term significance of the Geneva meeting will come to light in the practical deeds of the sides during the period that lies ahead. And it will depend on their readiness to consistently carry out the agreements that have been reached. This applies, above all, to the continuation of the Geneva negotiations on space and nuclear weapons. The aims of these negotiations, which were agreed to by the sides in January 1985 and completely confirmed in Geneva, i. e., the inadmissibility of an arms race in space and its cessation on earth, must be unconditionally observed. "The Soviet Union," the USSR Supreme Soviet noted in its decree "On the Results of the Soviet-American Summit Level Meeting in Geneva and the International Situation" is doing everything that depends on it to embody these agreements in practical affairs and expresses the hope that the United States of America will manifest the same responsible approach."

We have not had and do not have illusions concerning the policy of the United States. The forces that would like to continue an aggressive and adventurist policy are sufficiently powerful and active there. In this connection, people at times put the question: But if this is so, can one nevertheless expect something in practice?

Of course, the Geneva understandings are not an agreement. But what is contained in the joint declaration--this is a fundamental arrangement of the leaders of the two most important countries which is binding with respect to a great deal. It makes possible an active struggle for progress, above all--with respect to the main question, the question of international security.

It is impossible not to take into account something else. The Geneva meeting has stirred up all the forces aspiring to detente, to the cessation of the arms race. And this, too, plays a considerable role and influences the further course of events.

Realistically thinking circles of the West European states, as well as other capitalist countries, perceived Geneva as the approbation of their positions, as a prerequisite for possible new steps aimed at the improvement of the international climate.

"Spirit of Geneva"--these words will not disappear from the pages of the world press now. And what is very good is the fact that many of those who pronounce them do not nourish illusions to the effect that further everything will solve itself. No, another conclusion is drawn: The struggle of the socialist countries, the popular masses, and all peace-loving forces has produced the first result; now this struggle must be continued further and new positive changes must be attained.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, and the people of our country, their conclusion found reflection in the unanimous adoption of the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet. "The USSR Supreme Soviet," it is stated in this document, "is deeply convinced that the Soviet people, in moving toward an important event in the life of the country--the 27th CPSU Congress--will conquer new boundaries, through intensive labor, in socialist construction, in strengthening the economic and defensive might of our Fatherland, and in the social and spiritual development of society. In this lies the reliable foundation of the policy of peace conducted by the Soviet Union."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Agitator", 1986

/9274
CSO: 5200/1356

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET DELEGATION ARRIVES IN GENEVA FOR 5TH ROUND OF TALKS

Seeks 'Concrete Solutions'

LD061129 Moscow TASS in English 1120 GMT 6 May 86

[Text] Geneva May 6 TASS -- A Soviet delegation arrived here today for the 5th round of talks with a U.S. delegation on nuclear and space arms.

Viktor Karpov, leader of the Soviet delegation, said in a statement for the press at the Geneva airport that the delegation is under precise instructions to seek concrete solutions to the issues under discussion on the basis of equality and equal security. But obtaining results, he added, requires reciprocity from the U.S. side.

Karpov Comments

LD061432 Moscow TASS in English 1402 GMT 6 May 86

[Text] Geneva May 6 TASS -- The fifth round of the USSR-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space arms will be opening on May 8. Whether or not it will be possible to arrest the dangerous trend toward a continued and intensified arms race, to reduce tensions and diminish the threat of nuclear war largely depends on the resolution of the issues which make up the agenda for the Soviet-American negotiations, Viktor Karpov, the head of the Soviet delegation to the negotiations said upon arrival here today.

From the very outset of the talks, Viktor Karpov said, the Soviet Union has sought to negotiate and conclude, on a mutually acceptable basis, effective agreements that would result in preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth. The programme for phased elimination of nuclear weapons set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement of January 15, 1986, constitutes the basis of the Soviet position at the negotiations.

The Soviet side has tabled detailed and concrete proposals at the talks in all three negotiating areas -- space, strategic offensive arms and medium-range arms in Europe. These proposals are fully consistent with the objective of implementing the mandate for the negotiations agreed upon earlier with the United States.

Given the other side's goodwill and willingness to search for mutually acceptable solutions, the Soviet position opens up real opportunities for reaching agreement. There is no escaping the fact that no real progress has thus far been made at the talks. Despite the positive accords on fundamental issues and agreement to accelerate

the Geneva negotiations, reached at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the U.S. side so far has been doing virtually nothing to translate these decisions into reality.

Indeed, most recently -- this time outside the negotiations -- the United States has taken actions openly aimed at escalating tensions and heightening the military threat. This cannot but alarm everybody.

We are in no way advocating a linkage between the solution to the questions discussed in Geneva and the problems not directly related to it. The objective of curbing and stopping the arms race is our long-term policy of principle recently reaffirmed and further elaborated at the 27th CPSU Congress. It is precisely this position that the USSR delegation has been instructed to proceed from in the negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

This delegation is under clear instruction to see concrete solutions to the questions under negotiation on the basis of equality and equal security and in the interests of strengthening world peace. Obviously, getting results requires reciprocity from our partners -- the U.S. side, Viktor Karpov said.

In conclusion, Viktor Karpov on behalf of the USSR delegation expressed appreciation to the people and authorities of the canton and the city of Geneva for their invariable hospitality.

Preliminary Talks

LD061539 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 6 May 86

[Text] Geneva May 6 TASS -- Preliminary Soviet-American consultations on studying the question of centres to lessen nuclear danger were held here on May 5-6. The group of Soviet experts was headed by Ambassador Aleksey Obukhov and the group of American experts by Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle.

Nitze Comments Decried

LD061411 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT 6 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 6 TASS -- TASS Military News Analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

The Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons are to be resumed in Geneva and the U.S. Administration is conducting "preparations" for this event, if we may call them such. Has Washington set about drafting new constructive proposals and responses to Soviet initiatives? No, this practice obviously does not fit into the programme of the current American leadership. Washington has another problem, that of justifying its negative policy on the international scene as a whole and on the reduction and limitation of armaments in particular, and of shifting to the other side the blame for the deadlock at the talks.

Such "preparations" for the Geneva forum are exemplified by an address of Paul Nitze, a special adviser to the U.S. President and secretary of state, to the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. The latest round of the talks, according to him, failed to justify

the hopes of the USA for rapid progress, which had been urged by the joint statement on the results of the Soviet-American summit. So what was the conclusion of that special adviser? At the next round, he said on behalf of the U.S. Administration, the American negotiators will try anew to make the other side comply with its commitment to rapid progress.

These statements are intended for people who have no idea of the real state of affairs. The joint Soviet-American statement mentioned by Nitze clearly stipulated that work at the talks would be accelerated to fulfill the tasks formulated in the joint Soviet-American statement of January 8, 1985, those of averting an arms race in space, terminating it on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear weapons and strengthening strategic stability.

The Soviet Union is firmly and consistently following this course. It stands for preventing the militarisation of space, has put forward a concrete and clear plan for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, proposed a compromise on medium-range and operational-tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, and extended two times its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, a unique chance for actually starting the process of disarmament.

As for Washington, it has embarked on the road of actually subverting the Geneva accords. The United States stubbornly refuses to agree on a ban on space-strike weapons, is persistently reiterating its firm commitment to the policy of militarising space, and is going ahead full steam with its "star wars" programme. Can such a policy pursue the goal of "rapid" or any progress at all at the Geneva talks? It is clear to everyone that the only result can be the multiplication of obstacles on the road to agreements.

As for the Soviet proposals on nuclear armaments, the reaction of the American leadership to them is hardly indicative of its serious readiness to set about actually tackling the cardinal problems of removing the nuclear threat. Washington has never revised in a constructive spirit its proposals on strategic nuclear weapons, tabled last November, which are intended to give the USA unilateral advantage. It blocks the solution of the question of eliminating nuclear weapons in Europe by references to the position of Britain and France and by the demand for the weakening of the Soviet defences on the eastern border while the U.S. Armed Forces in that region would remain intact.

The United States is trying to drown any constructive proposals of the other side in various reservations, "linkages" and "conditions," which actually block the solution of the fundamental problems of disarmament. The U.S. unwillingness to embark on the road of nuclear disarmament is especially manifest in the matter of nuclear explosions, while the whole world is demanding that they be ended.

All this shows that precisely the Soviet Union has every right to present serious complaints to the American side over its failure to fulfil Soviet-American accords. To break the stalemate at the talks, Washington should radically revise its positions, give up its hope to secure unilateral advantage, take a constructive path and follow at the talks the fundamental principle of equality and equal security of the sides.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1356

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SARNEY SCORES SUPERPOWERS' ARMS RACE AT DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Sao Paulo O ESTADO DE SAO PAULO in Portuguese 2 Apr 86 p 5

[Text] Brasilia--President Jose Sarney yesterday sharply criticized the big superpowers for continuing "to ignore the political and legal obligations they formally assumed to reverse the arms race, with the consequent reduction of the waste of resources of which so many are in such need." That was Sarney's message to the more developed nations, read yesterday morning in Geneva by Ambassador Celso Antonio de Souza e Silva during his chairmanship of the disarmament conference.

"It was with that concern, which I believe is shared by all, that I established the second priority of Brazilian foreign policy: a just economic order that may be reflected as of now in equitable procedures in the management of the debt crisis," wrote President Sarney in the message delivered by Souza e Silva. This is the first time that Brazil has presided over the disarmament conference, a position occupied in rotation by the 40 member countries.

Following is the full text of President Sarney's message read in Geneva:

"At this time, in the current month of April, when the honor of presiding over the disarmament conference falls to Brazil, I wish to reiterate in a formal and solemn manner my government's commitment to the efforts and purposes of the only multilateral forum with the mandate of the international community to negotiate measures and agreements that are of vital interest to the peace and security of all countries.

"This is the same commitment that Brazil assumed a quarter of a century ago when the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee, of which we were a member, was instituted. Since then, we have maintained the same line of conduct with absolute fidelity.

"At a recent meeting with all the ministers of state of my government, last 20 February, when I disclosed the basic guidelines of the present administration, I established the priorities of our foreign policy, the first of which is phrased in the following terms: 'Disarmament and relaxation of tensions, to which Brazil will make a contribution inspired in its tradition of conciliation, balance and realism.'

"I am certain that this priority is in accord with the apprehensions and anxieties not only of the 40 member governments of this distinguished forum, but also of all the peoples of the world. Nor could it be otherwise. While a large part of mankind nourishes itself with little more than the hope of survival, direct and indirect military expenditures approach the neighborhood of \$1 trillion annually, adding a redoubled threat to the survival of all. While developing countries such as Brazil face severe sacrifices, including that of their ideal growth rate, in order to honor and settle their international commitments, the richer and superarmed countries continue to ignore the political and legal obligations they formally assumed to reverse the arms race, with the consequent reduction of the waste of resources of which so many are in such need.

"It was with that concern, which I believe is shared by all, that I established the second priority of Brazilian foreign policy: 'A just economic order that may be reflected as of now in equitable procedures in the management of the debt crisis.'

"De facto situations that only tend to aggravate the differences of wealth and power among nations have already gone on too long. Those tendencies and the negativistic expectations that nurture them must be reversed. Brazil hailed the resumption of bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union and noted with satisfaction the common objective of their leaders that, sooner or later, mankind should live free of nuclear arms. Without relinquishing our right to express an opinion and participate in decisions taken by the big powers that may affect our interests, we follow with increased attention the proposals and counterproposals that seek to draw the conflicting positions closer together, especially of the more strongly armed nations.

"For our part and in accordance with our means, we have not spared efforts or avoided commitments that might contribute to understandings and, particularly, to enlarging the areas in which the nuclear weapon should be totally banned.

"We adopted the option in favor of its proscription in the national territory and, later, we signed and ratified the treaty proscribing nuclear weapons in Latin America. More recently, at the opening of the proceedings of the 40th Session of the UN General Assembly, last 23 September, I had the opportunity to propose the extension of that ban to the South Atlantic, when I declared that 'Brazil will exert every effort within its power to preserve the South Atlantic as an area of peace, detached from the arms race, from the presence of nuclear weapons, and from any form of confrontation originating in other regions.'

"Your combined efforts in search of common objectives, raising the collective interests of the international community above the transitory and particular interests of each one, will make it possible for the important tasks that have been entrusted to you ultimately to be fulfilled.

"With those purposes in view, and with a genuine spirit of cooperation, in the name of the Brazilian Government, I express my best wishes for the success of the present and future efforts of the disarmament conference."

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS: CONGRESS URGING COMPLIANCE WITH SALT II

Senators' Letter to President

LD110826 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 11 Apr 86

[Text] Washington April 11 TASS -- Fifty-two senators sent a letter to President Reagan, in which they draw the President's attention to the inadmissibility of "discarding" the limits set by the SALT-2 Treaty.

The letter, which was released here Thursday, says that the summit meeting in Geneva laid down a solid foundation for improving Soviet-U.S. relations. The senators emphasize that despite essential differences existing between the two countries, they are united by many common interests, of which the foremost is to avoid a nuclear war.

The lawmakers urged the administration to continue complying with the provisions of the SALT-2 Treaty until a new Soviet-U.S. arms control agreement is concluded.

At a press conference in the arms control association the senators expressed concern over the administration's plans to abandon compliance with the restraints imposed by the treaty. Senator John Heinz, Republican, Pennsylvania, said that the decision to cancel the limits set by the SALT-2 treaty, if made by the President, would complicate efforts to reach a future agreement on reducing nuclear weapon arsenals and would lead to a new round in the arms race. Senator John Chafee, Republican, Rhode Island, said that in the light of the accord reached in Geneva to hold the second Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the U.S. observance with the basic provisions of the SALT-2 Treaty would bolster the chances for working out a new arms limitation agreement.

House Appeal

LD200342 Moscow TASS in English 2247 GMT 19 Apr 86

[Text] Washington April 20 TASS -- More than a half of members of the U.S. House of Representatives have urged President Reagan to observe the quantitative limitations on strategic weapons imposed by the SALT-2 treaty. The appeal has been signed by 221 out of 435 members of the House of Representatives, including 22 Republicans and 199 Democrats. Earlier a similar call to the U.S. President was addressed by 55 senators.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1355

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: REAGAN, ADVISERS TO DECIDE ON SALT II ADHERENCE

LD162326 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1850 GMT 15 Apr 86

(From "The World Today" program presented by Valeriy Korzin)

[Excerpts] THE WASHINGTON POST has reported that tomorrow President Reagan and his high-ranking advisers are preparing to hold a conference where they must decide whether to observe the SALT II agreement or not.

We are now witnessing a new upsurge in anti-agreement hysteria. What is involved is that a new American nuclear submarine, Trident, is due to go to sea in May. It is equipped with 24 missiles, and these missiles are already beyond the limits agreed in 1979.

In order not to go beyond the established ceiling, the United States needs to decommission two old Poseidon submarines. This is what the present dispute is about -- whether to dismantle the Poseidons or not.

Since last summer the situation has changed slightly, in fact. The Senate majority leader, Robert Dole, who previously supported observance of the agreement has crossed into the camp of its opponents and has even sent Reagan a letter with an appeal to keep all the available submarines. Also, the President's adviser, Robert McFarlane, was thought to have had quite a positive influence on Reagan, his replacement, Rear-Admiral John Poindexter is said to be more conservatively inclined.

However, it should not be forgotten that an end will be put to the arms race. In a word, we can say that SALT II is now a sort of touchstone of the U.S. foreign policy course.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1355

SALT/START ISSUES

MOSCOW: U.S. 'HAWKS' URGE RENUNCIATION OF SALT II

LD172211 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1900 GMT 17 Apr 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Many observers note that the attack on Libya is not some kind of isolated bellicose step by the present U.S. Administration, but the latest indication of its general aggressive approach to foreign policy. Let us recall Washington's provocative actions of just the recent period: the violation by U.S. ships of Soviet territorial waters off the Crimean coast, the shipment of the latest Stinger antiaircraft missiles to the Afghan dushman and UNITA gangs in Angola, the nuclear bomb blast in Nevada, and the attempts to increase military aid for the Nicaraguan contras. And now Washington is discussing whether it should perform another reckless action and renounce observance of the SALT II treaty, which, as everyone knows, was not ratified by the United States. U.S. President Reagan has held a special conference on this issue with his leading foreign policy advisers in the White House. At the end of May, sea trials of the eighth American atomic Trident-class missile-carrying submarine will begin. Here you see a previous test of a submarine of this class. It is fitted with 24 multiple-warhead ballistic missiles. [video shows submarine at sea, missile being launched from submerged vessel]

As a result of the commissioning of the latest missile-carrying submarine, named the Nevada, the United States will exceed the limit for missiles with multiple warheads fixed in the SALT II treaty, if they do not dismantle two old Poseidon-class atomic submarines at the same time. At the White House conference, contradictory views were expressed as to whether the United States should continue to adhere to the provisions of the SALT II treaty. Such Washington hawks as Secretary of Defense Weinberger, CIA Director Casey, and director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Adelman are demanding that observance of the agreement be renounced.

It is typical that, as THE WASHINGTON POST reports, even the U.S. naval command does not in principle object to the dismantling of two Poseidon submarines, since they have been in service for more than 22 years; they are obsolete and in need of major overhaul, and even after overhaul their service life will only be very brief. The supporters of a hard line, however, are insisting that these atomic submarines be kept in order to challenge the Soviet Union and to undermine the possibility of achieving any agreement limiting the arms race. And in order to justify this position,

Washington has again started to talk about alleged violations of the SALT II treaty by the Soviet Union. These conjectures have already repeatedly been rebutted by Soviet representatives at the most authoritative level.

It is not surprising that the plans to wreck one of the few Soviet-American agreements remaining in force have aroused alarm even in the U.S. Congress: Fifty-two U.S. senators have sent President Reagan a message in which they insist that the treaty be observed. A similar letter has also been sent to the White House by more than 150 members of the House of Representatives. As UPI reports, the U.S. President will make a final decision in a few days, after the United States has consulted its allies.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1355

SALT/START ISSUES

U.S. 'USING CHARGES OF SOVIET VIOLATIONS AS 'COVER'

LD241941 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 24 Apr 86

[Text] Moscow April 24 TASS -- Follows commentary by Vladimir Chernyshev, a TASS military news analyst:

The U.S. Administration has staged a fresh farce, pretending that it wishes to "seek council" from its allies and maybe even to "heed" their opinion. Perhaps, there is "awareness" in Washington that after the aggression against sovereign Libya launched in open disregard of the views and interests of the same allies, the aggression, which set off a storm of indignation and hurt the feelings of people among their camp, the time has now come to do something in the manner befitting an "ally".

The scenario deals this time with the Salt-2 treaty. The title roles are performed by Paul Nitze, ambassador at large in the field of arms control, who appears in the West European scene, and Edward Rowley, special adviser to the President and secretary of state, who was sent on a mission to the countries of the Far East. They are quite worthy actors. Yet, at times, they "let the cat out of the bang". Thus, for example, Nitze said in a "DER SPIEGEL" interview that of great importance was not arms control, but the nuclear threat. In translation into the language of the policy of "neoglobalism", this means that the main thing is to have an opportunity to threaten other states and peoples with nuclear weapons, using them as a "big stick".

Yet Paul Nitze was not reprimanded in Washington for that, since the President himself made prior to that an even more tell-tale statement to the effect that it can be argued, should an argument arise in general, only what weapons the USA needed and what weapons it did not need, but by no means whether the USA should renounce weapons for the sake of treaties and agreements.

This is the "clue" for the farce to be staged in the capitals of allies by the Washington emissaries. For a start they were told to sweeten the pill, by saying that President Reagan had decided "on a preliminary basis" not to violate a single provision of the SALT-2 treaty in May this year, when the eighth nuclear-powered missile carrying submarine "Nevada" of the "Trident" system will start on running trials. The United States is disassembling two old submarines of the Poseidon type not to exceed the limit set by the treaty for the launchers of MIRVed missiles.

Yet the main point is not that "spoonful of honey". In the first place, the emissaries are to warn the allies that the current decision, as was also the case in June 1985, is a single act. As the newspaper "NEW YORK TIMES" said, this autumn the USA will again

examine the question whether it is expedient to observe the limitations imposed by the SALT-2 treaty, since in November-December the outfitting of bombers carrying cruise missiles will take the USA above the limit set by the treaty for MIRV'ed missiles and bombers carrying cruise missiles.

The allies of Washington should have no illusions as to the fact that as soon as some or other provision of the treaty becomes an obstacle to the programmes drawn up in the USA, for the creation and buildup of strategic weapons, it will be "amputated".

This "approach" to the contractual-legal basis of the limitation and reduction of arms has been explicitly spelled out by Caspar Weinberger, U.S. secretary of defense, who said that America's interests are nowhere carved in stone and that judgment of the vital interests will sometimes depend on the circumstances of a specific instance. The need to win takes firmness and determination on the part of America, he said. So, Washington's allies should firmly "learn" that the USA is set for "victory" and does not intend to limit in any way the freedom of the choice of methods to achieve that aim.

They would be well advised to realise another thing too: No matter what the advice may be, no matter what the allies may insist on, the U.S. Administration will act as it chooses. Could they have forgotten the principles of the current U.S. Administration? The same Pentagon chief has openly spelled out another "postulate" of Washington, by saying that the USA can no longer deceive itself by the idea that its commitments to the allies are based on the altruistic wish to protect their freedom. In real fact, the protection of their freedom is simply the protection of America's own freedom on forward lines. He could not be more frank. This is a formula according to which they are going to do whatever they wish, to act as they choose. That is precisely why the allies are informed now that the limits envisaged by the SALT-2 treaty may be exceeded in the future, should weighty military reasons for that appear. Indeed, there are no "altruists" among the current U.S. Administration.

And, at last, the Washington emissaries are "bringing to the attention" of the allies that the USSR has allegedly more than once violated the provisions of the treaty. Why should they have repeated these lies now? The answer to that question is contained in another element of Washington's "instructions": The USA intends to take appropriate measures. The U.S. leadership, which ordered the Pentagon last June to broaden the programme for a modernisation of the U.S. strategic force, is again trying to use a false pretext for further building up the arms race. Trying to camouflage its own violations of the provisions of the treaty, the U.S. Administration is picturing them as measures allegedly taken "in response" to some mythical violations by the USSR.

The U.S. leadership has to stage all kinds of shows as a cover for its actions aimed at creeping out of treaties and agreements. This protective cover is designed as a blind not only for the allies, but also for the United States public which realises the danger of this policy. The SALT-2 treaty is far from being ideal, but if the restrictions imposed by it are broken, the arms race will further spiral, absorbing with no useful purpose new billions of dollars and increasing the danger hanging over mankind, the newspaper PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER said editorially.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1355

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS: U.S. ENVOY MEETS WITH NATO ALLIES ON SALT II TREATY

LD262200 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1335 GMT 26 Apr 86

[Text] London, 26 Apr (TASS) -- The Reagan administration has sent P. Nitze, special envoy for arms control issues, to Western Europe in order to clarify for the NATO allies the U.S. position regarding the SALT II treaty. Nitze is supposed to pressure the allies in order to gain their support for Washington's intention to exceed the strategic weapons limits that are fixed in the treaty.

As the London TIMES reports, P. Nitze has consulted with the permanent members of the NATO Council on the SALT II Treaty. The U.S. allies, taking into account that the U.S. program of "nuclear modernization" opens up possibilities for exceeding the limits fixed by this treaty, have spoken out for Washington's strict observance of the clauses of this treaty, the paper notes.

New York, 26 Apr (TASS) -- As the AP reports from The Hague, the Netherlands Government has called on the U.S. Administration to keep the U.S. nuclear potential within the limits fixed by the SALT II treaty.

Addressing a press conference after a meeting with Nitze, Netherlands Prime Minister R. Lubbers stated: We have pointed out to the United States that we would appreciate it if both the letter and the spirit of the SALT II Treaty are observed.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1355

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET MAJ GEN CLAIMS U.S. ATTEMPTING TO UNDERMINE SALT II

PM291055 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Apr 86 Second Edition p 3

[Major General Yu. Viktorov article: "SALT II: The United States Is Preparing To Undermine (the Treaty)"]

[Text] Sea trials of the new (Ohio class) submarine Nevada equipped with 24 Trident-1 ICBM launchers are to begin in the United States on 20 May. In order not to exceed the limit of 1,200 launchers for MIRVed ICBM's and SLBM's permitted under the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty, the United States must either dismantle two of its old corresponding number of Minuteman missile launchers.

The prospect of this kind of "disarmament" in the face of "Soviet military might" has sparked off a storm of indignation in the conservative right wing of the U.S. Republican Party that has been seized by a fit of chauvinism. There has probably never been such a protracted and embittered struggle waged within the administration as the current struggle concerning the question of compliance with the provisions of the SALT II treaty. Downright hysterical appeals to write off this document as obsolete have been heard. At the same time, Pentagon officials have openly demanded that the aforementioned Poseidon submarines be retained in service.

Furthermore, C. Bennett, member of the House Armed Services Committee has proposed that the "16 Poseidon ballistic missile launchers be replaced by a minimum of 30 vertical nuclear-tipped Tomahawk cruise missile launchers." "By arming ourselves with Poseidon submarines modified as powerful cruise missile carriers," he explained his 'option' in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, "we would obtain more sea-launched nuclear warheads than we have now." The zealous advocates of a "strong America" also favor another direct violation of the SALT II treaty; they are proposing that existing Minuteman-2 missiles (with one warhead) be replaced by Minuteman-3 missiles (with 3 warheads).

Clearly, the people across the ocean intend to scrap the SALT II treaty which, though unratified, has been observed until now. They are seeking, in particular, the unconstrained deployment of sea- and ground-launched long-range cruise missiles. They would like the Pentagon to be able, in addition to completing the MX missile tests, to complete the development [razrabotka] of another new ICBM -- the Midgetman. According to the Baltimore newspaper, THE SUN, the U.S. Air Force has already concluded contracts totaling near \$1.5 million for planning and design work connected with the Midgetman, while Congress has appropriated \$624.6 million for the current fiscal year alone.

These and other demands to preserve and develop the U.S. "deterrent" at all costs have been given a "fitting" propaganda backing. For the umpteenth time, a frenzied ballyhoo inspired by the "hawks" has been launched in the United States to "accuse" the Soviet

Union of "having violated" treaty obligations. The absurdity of these attacks has been refuted more than once and convincingly. Moreover, the provocative problem around the Soviet-U.S. agreements has provoked doubts even in the United States itself. "In all probability," THE NEW YORK TIMES, for instance, wrote recently, "it was highly irresponsible on the part of the administration to officially accuse the Soviet Union of having violated the overall quantitative limits stipulated by SALT II, while up-to-date [operativnyye] data published by the Committee of the Chiefs of Staff indicate that the Russians are quite conscientiously abiding by the required limits."

However, despite the real state of affairs, the fabrications concocted in Washington to cast doubt on the USSR's honesty continue to be widely used by the U.S. Administration with the aim of duping the public and extorting funds to launch a new round of the arms race.

And -- most important -- they are used by the White House to justify its own intentions to disregard Soviet-U.S. agreements in the future, agreements which have so far prevented the Pentagon from building up its militarist "muscles" at an "astronomical rate" as the military-industrial complex would have it.

It is well known that rather than the United States, the USSR has very serious grounds to question the compliance by the other side with accords reached in the past. Is it perhaps an indication of the Washington leadership's serious attitude toward its obligations when the United States consigns to oblivion the accords elaborated jointly with the USSR defining the aim of the new talks on nuclear and space arms, for instance? Judging by appearances, the people in the White House prefer not even to mention their recent "desire" to seek an end to the arms race on earth and to prevent the arms race from spreading to space.

Washington officialdom has long been seeking to undermine the SALT II treaty, violating, or teetering on the brink of violating, a number of its articles and provisions. The "technique" used in this kind of action has been rehearsed down to the smallest detail. First, the Pentagon's needs are identified, that is to say it is determined which treaty or which particular article is hampering it from creating and deploying new arms. Then a suitable counterpart is chosen among Soviet arms limited under a given agreement. At the next stage, false "arguments" are concocted, designed in the intention of their authors if not to pillory the "violator," then at least to cast doubt on the USSR's honesty. The assistance of the news media is enlisted. And another orgy of anti-Soviet propaganda is launched. The fact that all the arguments are pure and simple lies does not worry anyone.

The inspirers and organizers of the arms race in the United States were in dire need of arguments of this kind now when the West European NATO countries with whom Washington consulted on the stance to be taken on SALT II reacted negatively to the "evasive maneuvers" staged by the White House. They let the United States know without beating around the bush that its "halfway measures" (such as proposing to put the two Poseidon nuclear submarines into dry dock) are nothing but a clear and provocative violation of the treaty. The West Europeans reaffirmed that their governments would not be pleased by any steps taken by Washington with the aim of undermining the treaty or directly violating its provisions.

These are just some of the facts which reflect the attitude of the United States to its treaty obligations. However, having released a dirty wave of accusations against the Soviet Union, the Washington administration was put under pressure by its West European allies and sober-minded people in its own country. It then resorted to a diversionary maneuver. Hypocritical noises were made on the lines of "America must go another mile to meet the Soviet Union." Compliance with adopted treaty obligations is depicted as some kind of "favor"! In its approach to treaty obligations, the Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that they must be strictly complied with. That is, complied with by all who accepted them.

/12858

CSO: 5200/1355

SALT/START ISSUES

FRG PRESS COMMENTS ON REAGAN'S ADHERENCE TO SALT II

'Positive Signal'

DW230937 Cologne Deutschlandfund Network in German 0505 GMT 23 Apr 86

[From the press review]

[Text] One of today's editorial issues is President Reagan's decision to observe the stipulations of the unratified SALT II.

NEUE OSNABRUECKER ZEITUNG writes: Because progress in arms control or disarmament issues is usually as rare as it is minor, the preservation of existing balances of force is sometimes considered a noteworthy or even praiseworthy event. Therefore, Bonn is fully satisfied with President Reagan's decision to continue quietly to observe the SALT II agreement, which has been decided upon by both big powers but not carried out.

What is unique about it is not in disarmament policy, but in the psychology. Naturally, Reagan could just as easily have acted differently, following the advice of his secretary of defense, who always advocates signaling strength and who considers adherence to the SALT ceiling superfluous. The fact that it came out differently permits the vague hope that Washington has not completely lost the feeling for cultivating a reasonable and trusting climate between the big powers.

KOELNISCHE RUNDSCHAU maintains: The fact that Reagan again has conceded that the United States will adhere to the stipulations of the treaty as if SALT II were in force, demonstrates that he is really serious about disarmament.

It also shows that the U.S. President wants to avoid anything that could strain relations between the two superpowers further. Reagan obviously does not want to deepen existing differences of opinion, such as on a nuclear test ban, so as not to jeopardize CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev's recent attempts at reconciliation. Breaking the SALT II ceiling, which allows 1,200 intercontinental missiles in both sides, would have certainly irritated Gorbachev. So Foreign Minister Genscher is right in calling Reagan's move a positive signal to the Soviet Union and an encouraging and confidence-building measure.

WESTDEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE of Essen states the following: The U.S. President has now basically decided that he will continue to observe the treaty ceiling of 1,200 ground and sea-based intercontinental missiles, and scrap two older submarines if a new missile-equipped one is put into service. The agreement of the NATO partners is a foregone conclusion. They continue to consider adherence to SALT II and the ABM

agreement an indispensable framework for further arms control measures. The continuation of nuclear testing, despite the Soviet test halt offers, has cast a shadow on the Geneva negotiations. The climate for a promising continuation of talks would have further deteriorated through nonadherence to the SALT II stipulations. In view of Soviet proposals, which -- according to Western opinion -- could contain positive aspects, it would have led to further U.S. losses in the competition for public opinion. Unfortunately, it must be doubted whether such considerations could play a lasting role -- if they have ever -- in view of what is being said in Washington about new nuclear weapons.

Decision 'Not Sufficient'

DW231037 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU In German 23 Apr 86 p 3

[Editorial signed SIE: "Treaties"]

[Text] Washington -- When Ronald Reagan took over the presidential office in 1981, he called the SALT II agreement on limiting strategic weapons "deficient." Before that, in the election campaign, he had used even stronger words. Now he has again decided to adhere to that treaty. That is good, but not sufficient. It shows that both superpowers speak about their relations differently than they act. Mikhail Gorbachev publicly announced a breakthrough in the Geneva and Vienna disarmament negotiations, while his negotiators there do not have any such instruction. Ronald Reagan does not miss a chance to accuse the Soviets and their "land of evil," while he also wants them to adhere to an unratified treaty.

However, the foundation is fragile. Both sides continue to develop more precise and less vulnerable offensive weapons. But most of all, Reagan has fully devoted himself to his Strategic Defense Initiative, SDI ("star wars"). If one believed in implementing it, and Reagan's government stands rather isolated there, it would reduce credibility if further offensive weapons were stockpiled.

SALT II is important; however, armament is being pursued in space and in areas not covered by treaties. If SALT II is adhered to while simultaneously billions are spent on SDI research, it shows most of all that this world needs new arms control treaties.

/9274
CSO: 5200/2682

SALT/START ISSUES

NORWEGIAN DAILY SUPPORTS REAGAN ON NUCLEAR SUB DECISION

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 24 Apr 86 p 2

[Editorial: "A Chance to Seize"]

[Text] President Ronald Reagan has made one of his most important decisions since he was sworn in as President of the United States in January 1980. One and one-half years earlier his predecessor, Jimmy Carter, signed the SALT-2 agreement on limitation of strategic nuclear weapons. The then Soviet leader also signed the agreement.

SALT-2 has been a cornerstone in the strategic relationship between the two superpowers, even though it was never ratified by the United States. Both countries have had a tacit agreement to adhere to SALT-2 and Reagan has chosen to continue this line despite very strong pressure from certain circles within his own administration.

Older nuclear submarines of the Poseidon class were taken out of service when the new Trident submarines with more missiles per ship were commissioned. Thereby the United States is adhering to the upper limit for missiles which was established by SALT-2.

The same thing was done last June, but then Reagan reserved the right to evaluate the agreement again. Since then the United States has directed accusations against the Soviet Union that the country is violating SALT-2 by building and deploying the mobile intercontinental missile SS-25, among other things.

By making the decision the American President has sent a signal to the Soviets which should be regarded as both constructive and positive. In all the discussion about whether or not there will be a new summit meeting between Reagan and Gorbachov this year, their declaration of principles from their last meeting in November has been in the background. Then they both declared their intentions to reduce numbers of nuclear weapons, and in the discussions in Geneva the negotiators from both countries are trying to convert this declaration into firm agreements.

Gorbachov stated during the visit to East Berlin several days ago that he is willing for a summit if the atmosphere between the two countries gets better.

The Russians have also stated how important it is to get agreements on arms control.

It is no secret that there has been a hard tug of war in the United States about what line should be followed. Many of Reagan's advisors regarded the asserted Soviet violations of SALT-2 as so serious that the United States could disregard the agreement. Reagan has also been more than sharply criticized by Moscow for his attitude toward disarmament, and that has strengthened the advocates of a hard line toward the Soviets.

Nevertheless Reagan has decided to adhere to SALT-2. This is an opportunity which Moscow should utilize, and not just for propaganda purposes. The negotiations at Geneva have already gone a long way in certain areas, and given the political will it may now be possible that the arms spiral could start downward.

9287
CSO:5200/2679

BRIEFS

COMMISSION SESSION ENDS--Geneva, April 23 TASS--A regular session of the Soviet-U.S. Standing Consultative Commission ended here today. The commission had been set up to promote the implementation of aims and provisions of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the interim agreement on certain measures pertaining to strategic offensive arms limitation that were concluded between the USSR and the USA on May 26, 1972 and the agreement on the measures to lessen the danger of an outbreak of nuclear war concluded between the two countries on September 30, 1971. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 23 Apr 86 LD] /12858

MOBILE MIRV MISSILE PLANS--New York, April 25 TASS--President Reagan has ordered in a classified directive a study to investigate the question of developing a new mobile multiple-warhead missile, THE NEW YORK TIMES reported today, quoting administration officials. "The new weapon could be developed as a complement to others in the land-based missile arsenal," the officials were quoted as saying. It is presumed that the new missile should be of the same type as the intercontinental ballistic missile, Minuteman, the backbone of the U.S. nuclear offensive potential. The President's order convincingly confirms that the Washington administration intends to go ahead with its course toward building up the first-strike nuclear arsenal. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1135 GMT 25 Apr 86 LD] /12858

CSO: 5200/1355

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRENCH JETS EQUIPPED WITH CRUISE MISSILES

AU051415 Paris AFP in English 1414 GMT 5 May 86

[Text] Paris, May 5 (AFP) — France has equipped six Mirage IV-P fighter planes with the nation's first nuclear warhead cruise missiles. The air-to-ground medium-range missiles have been operational since early this month, equipped on the Mirage planes of the Mont-de-Marsan Air Base in southwest France. The supersonic, 840 kilogram (184, 80 pound), 8.30-meter (27 feet nine inch) missile has a nuclear warhead of 300 kilotonnes, or 15 times as powerful as the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. The missile can fly autonomously at Mach-3 for 200 kilometers (125 miles), or 80 kilometers (50 miles) at low altitude. The warhead is miniaturized and specially designed to avoid radar detection.

France has an independent nuclear force with nuclear submarines based at the Albion plateau, in southeast France. Last year, France introduced a sixth nuclear submarine, the *Inflexible*, with new M-4 multiple missile warheads. Mirage IV planes equipped with nuclear warheads have been part of the French arsenal since 1964. They have been updated to suit the new cruise missiles. The new Mirage IV-P model will be in service for the next decade.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2683

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

FRG'S KOHL INTERVIEWED ON GORBACHEV VISIT

DW241030 Hamburg BILD in German 24 Apr 86 pp 1, 12

[Interview with Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl by W. Kenntemich and R. Voelkel;
no place or date given]

[Excerpt]

BILD: How do you assess the appearance of Kremlin chief Gorbachev at the SED congress in East Berlin?

Kohl: I hesitate to call the general secretary's disarmament proposals mere propagandistic fireworks. They contain elements which we have to take seriously. We -- the Germans, in the center of Europe -- are particularly interested in conventional disarmament. It is in that field that the imbalance is the greatest. Vienna, where troop reduction in Europe has been negotiated for 11 years, will show whether the Soviet Union is willing to change its position. That applies to the area of reduction as well as to the agreement on verification. We would welcome Mr Gorbachev proving his words by deeds at the negotiating table.

BILD: Will Gorbachev visit the Federal Republic this year?

Kohl: I invited General Secretary Gorbachev to visit the Federal Republic of Germany in March 1985 when I was in Moscow to take part in the funeral ceremony for his predecessor, Chernenko. It goes without saying that the invitation still holds today, but I would like to leave it to Mr Gorbachev to fix the date for a visit to Bonn.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2682

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

FRG PRESS VIEWS GORBACHEV PROPOSALS AT SED CONGRESS

SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG Editorial

DW221117 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 22 Apr 86 p 4

[Josef Joffe editorial: "The East Berlin Offer"]

[Text] In January, the Soviet general secretary offered total nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. This weekend in East Berlin he offered a "considerable reduction" of conventional armed forces in Europe. The ground and air forces of both alliances are supposed to be sharply reduced, as are "tactical operational" nuclear weapons -- in an area reaching "from the Atlantic to the Urals." With last Friday's offer Gorbachev closed the last gap in his disarmament offensive. For Moscow there is nothing now that is supposed to be either scrapped, reduced, redeployed, or inspected. Gorbachev, the traveling salesman in negotiations, has made offers ranging from the megaton monster missile to an an infantry bullet.

In addition, two other things are remarkable: First, the extraordinary vagueness of the proposal, and second, the extraordinarily favorable attitude with which the offer was received in the West. Gorbachev's move contains just a few sentences, and yet it sounds to many ears as if it were really suitable "to cut the knot that has become ever tighter in the many years of the Vienna negotiations."

That is what the general secretary said about the Vienna troop reduction talks (MBFR), which have given many a diplomat from East and West the opportunity to live along the beautiful Danube metropolis without doing much work. Since 1973 MBFR envoys have produced many papers, but have not reduced troop strength by one single soldier. As we know, nothing is eternal. Maybe Gorbachev's East Berlin words are a hint at the sword that is to cut the Gordian knot. However, it is not very likely.

That does not mean that one should rashly discard Gorbachev's proposal as propaganda, although it was obviously meant as a move on the worldwide chess board of public opinion. Truly, the general secretary must be taken at his word. Naturally, nobody should on the very start apply the "stamp of incredibility" to the Gorbachev speech, as Foreign Minister Genscher rightly said. The real problems lie somewhere else.

The first is the problem of expectations. They have been increased in the West, particularly by the surprising offer to admit "on-site inspections" to check reliably the process of withdrawal "in all phases." That would be great historical progress -- applied to German conditions, it would be comparable to an oath by a known Bavarian

29 May 1986

state party never to pick on a chancellor belonging to a northern sister party. It is a fact that the Soviet Union has fought since the beginning of their disarmament diplomacy in the twenties [as published] any on-site inspection. It is a further fact that at the end of the recent MBFR round in Vienna, Moscow rejected the modest Western inspection proposals as being "unrealistic." That involved only 20,000 Soviet soldiers, who would be withdrawn in a first phase from the MBFR areas.

Even if under Gorbachev a real revolution in the field of "verification" should be in the offing, the unchangeable curse of political geography will remain. Gorbachev exploits that curse skillfully by demanding that "the units to be dismantled must be dissolved and their weaponry either destroyed or stored on national territory." That clearly means that U.S. troops must withdraw with their equipment 5,000 km over the Atlantic, while the Soviets need withdraw only 800 km behind the Bug River. He who believes that Western European security needs more than Gorbachev's vow "never" to be the first to attack must ask: "What do you think about geographic asymmetry?" Equal security, Moscow's pet concept, demands unequal reductions, which would take the sting from the East's geographical advantage. A serious agreement would always have to ensure that heavy U.S. equipment (tanks, artillery, aircraft) remain in Europe to permit the withdrawn GI's to return quickly.

A third problem is political asymmetry. Is it really imaginable that the Soviet Union will drastically reduce its army of 400,000 men in the GDR? Those troops are stationed in the GDR not just to resist NATO; they are the strategic vice that keeps the Soviet imperium together in Eastern Europe. What Kremlin chief would risk that vice for the benefit of disarmament?

In short, Gorbachev's speech -- as its predecessors -- must be considered not a program but a signal. Even the new general secretary cannot cut knots that have been tightened by geography, history, and interest. However, he wants to do business with the West. But what a treaty will look like will not be decided by some pleasant sentences uttered at East Berlin party congresses, but by the negotiators in hard, long, and detailed work.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU Article

DW221212 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 22 Apr 86 p 3

[Karl-Heinz Baum article: "Message for the West"]

[Text]. The 11th SED Congress is over. General Secretary Erich Honecker was reelected. With its four new members, the Politburo -- the actual leadership of the GDR -- became slightly younger. Wages will increase, the baby year will be introduced with the first child. The children's allowance for two, three, or more children will be doubled in July next year; the economy will be further intensified and cranked up by even more electronics. Those are the essential statements of this party congress, for the fourth time led by Erich Honecker.

However, the message of this SED Congress is quite a different one. CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, with his appearance before the plenum and his visit to Cecilienhof Palace, where the Potsdam agreement was signed little less than 41 years ago, put his stamp on the proceedings. The message for the West is: despite SDI, despite bombs on Libya, the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states are ready for dialogue.

Gorbachev impressively emphasized that in East Berlin when he submitted his proposal "to reduce considerably" conventional troops from the Atlantic to the Ural. He thus made a proposal -- as reaction in the West demonstrates -- that will not be rejected instantly, as were quite a few former Soviet proposals. In Bonn, Foreign Minister Genscher and Defense Minister Woerner jointly urged careful analysis, and the answer from Washington is hardly different.

Expert negotiations will show how serious the Soviet Union is about reducing conventional troops and weapons. Many a great announcement has been shredded in the mill of expert debates.

It may be that Gorbachev's proposal is a new attempt to withdraw U.S. Armed Forces from Western Europe, or at least to reduce them radically, which was an old Soviet expectation from the forties, when the anti-Hitler coalition broke up after the Potsdam conference.

The proposal also has a psychological side. Why, the Western European countries will have to ask, do we actually have to prolong compulsory military service -- in the face of a sudden drop in birth rates caused by the pill -- if bilateral troop reduction in Europe is in the offing anyway? The East bloc faces the same problem. One can believe Gorbachev when he says that the socialist camp would prefer to use many persons who are soldiers today to "build socialism." The reduction of Soviet Armed Forces might reduce the "fear of the Russians" more than the reduction of nuclear missiles, the combat strength of which is beyond imagination.

It is no coincidence that Gorbachev is assuring Western Europeans that the Soviet Union will never attack Western Europe from the most western outpost of his empire. That, too, is an attempt to reduce fear. Gorbachev's proposal is also meant to heighten Soviet credibility in Western Europe. It comes at a time when West Europeans find it harder and harder to identify with the current U.S. Administration -- as discussions between London and Rome show. As the success of such proposals cannot be measured for 3 or even 10 years, it is clear that the young -- compared to U.S. President Reagan -- man in the Kremlin is thinking about the post-Reagan era, that Gorbachev is already paving the way for it.

The desire for dialogue announced by Gorbachev and thus unanimously by SED General Secretary Erich Honecker and GDR Premier Willi Stoph means the meetings between Reagan and Gorbachev -- and, at a somewhat lower level, between Honecker and Federal Chancellor Kohl -- scheduled for this year can take place, if further trouble can be avoided.

What might concern the SED general secretary and his comrades in the Politburo more is Gorbachev's demand to extend the economic integration of GDR and the other East bloc countries to CEMA (Regards from the political union of the European Community.) But as a glutton for work, the GDR serves the Soviet Union as an example. How did Gorbachev put it? The abbreviation "GDR" is translated into Russian as follows: "davai, davai, raboty" - hurry, hurry, work.

/9274
CSO: 5200/2682

RELATED ISSUES

CANADA: YUKON LEGISLATURE OPPOSES CRUISE TESTING

Vancouver THE SUN in English 3 Apr 86 p A1

[Text]

WHITEHORSE — The Yukon legislature voted 8-7 Wednesday to pass a resolution urging that tests of cruise missiles and other weapon systems not be conducted over the territory.

Government leader Tony Penikett urged members to vote with their consciences. Seven NDP members favored the resolution, the six Conservatives opposed it and the two Liberals split their votes.

"The cruise missile is a menace," declared Art Webster, the New Democrat who sponsored the private member's motion. "It is a menace because of its poor track record."

Earlier this year, a cruise missile fell to the ice in the Beaufort Sea north of the Yukon coast. The current path of U.S. cruise missile tests goes over the Northwest Territories, the northeast corner of B.C. and northern Alberta.

The Yukon resolution will be sent to Ottawa and Washington.

/13104

CSO: 5220/36

RELATED ISSUES

CANADA: CONSORTIUM TO BUILD LLAD AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 17 Apr 86 p A3

[Article by Jeff Sallot]

[Text]

The federal Government has picked a Canadian-Swiss consortium to build a low-level air defence system, and now has to find about \$1-billion to pay the bill.

Buying an LLAD system, which is intended to protect two Canadian air bases and an army brigade in West Germany, would signal Canada's intent to keep forces in Europe for some time.

The Cabinet of Prime Minister Brian Mulroney picked the Litton-Oerlikon system this week from among three competitors, and announced plans to negotiate a final contract "within the limits of defence spending allocations."

The main element is the Air Defence Anti-Tank System, developed by Martin Marietta Corp., another member of the consortium, under contract to Oerlikon.

ADATS comprises twin 35 mm guns and eight laser-guided missiles, which can be fired against tanks and terrain-hugging aircraft at ranges of up to eight kilometres. They are mounted on a tracked vehicle and operated by a three-man crew. Canada is expected to purchase between 30 and 40 of the mobile units.

The decision was made on Tuesday just in time for a simultaneous announcement yesterday in Ottawa and Prince Edward Island, where provincial Conservatives are trying to hold power in an election on Monday. Litton Systems Canada Ltd. and Oerlikon-Bührle Machine Tool Works of Switzerland promised to build an \$18-million radar manufacturing plant in PEI if the consortium became the prime contractor on the project. Premier James Lee has predicted that the project will eventually create about 800 direct and indirect jobs for the Island economy.

The consortium forecasts that it will create about 2,600 jobs through direct employment across the country during the five-year term of the project.

Opposition defence critics quickly questioned the political motives in the timing of the announcement, and jumped on the fact that the Government is not really signing a contract yet.

"Is the Government or isn't it going ahead with the project?" Liberal Leonard Hopkins asked. "And where is the money, because it isn't in the budget estimates."

New Democrat Derek Blackburn said that "the key to this is the political need of Jim Lee. The fact is there is no contract."

The Government originally intended to sign a contract by April 1, but, as with so many other proposed capital projects in the ambitious Tory defence program, financial constraints have been a problem.

Associate Defence Minister Harvie Andre acknowledged the financial problems in an interview yesterday, saying a major issue in the negotiations with Litton-Oerlikon "will be the cash flow, which is particularly of concern for us because we have a lot of capital projects on the go."

The Tories want to stretch out the financing over a number of years to ease some of the pressures on the capital budget of the Department of National Defence.

DND is completing a modernization of Canada's fighter aircraft squadrons, and has other capital projects on the books that will cost about \$650-million in the current fiscal year.

In Halifax yesterday, Tory MP Howard Crosby said that the modernization of the Tribal-class destroyers is suffering from the competition for funds.

There have been discussions within DND and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization about the practical value of Canada keeping ground forces and fighter squadrons in Central Europe. The Canadian Forces are already overextended, with missions assigned in Germany, Norway and North America.

/13104
CSO: 5220/36

RELATED ISSUES

PRC ENVOY TO UN ON DISARMAMENT COMMENTS ON ARMS RACE

OW070819 Beijing XINHUA in English 0751 GMT 7 May 86

[Text] United Nations, May 6 (XINHUA) -- Chinese Ambassador for Disarmament Fan Guoxiang, depicting the present disarmament situation, said today, "On the one hand, the general atmosphere has somewhat improved, offering a bit of optimism. On the other, nothing has been achieved in the concrete implementation of arms reductions." He made the remarks when reviewing the development of disarmament in the past year at the 1986 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. The annual session of the Disarmament Commission, which began yesterday and will last four weeks, will focus on various aspects of the arms race, particularly nuclear disarmament.

The newly-appointed Chinese ambassador for disarmament noted that though the United States and the Soviet Union, which possess the largest nuclear arsenals, undertook some responsibilities for disarmament during the past year, their arms race was still continuing and even extending into a new sphere -- the outer space.

Fan reiterated the Chinese Government's nine-point basic position and views on disarmament, which were outlined by Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang last March at a rally in Beijing marking the International Year of Peace.

The basic position and views include: The United States and the Soviet Union should take the lead in halting the testing, production and deployment of all types of nuclear weapons and drastically reduce all types of nuclear weapons they have deployed anywhere inside and outside their countries and destroy them on the spot; the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament should be the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons; all nuclear-weapon states should undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons in any circumstances; along with nuclear arms reduction there should be a drastic reduction of conventional arms; an international agreement on the complete prohibition of space weapons should be concluded through negotiations as soon as possible; and all countries should enjoy equal rights to participate in the discussions and settlement of problems related to disarmament.

The position and views, he stressed, had been formulated after taking into account the desire of all the peoples in the world and the position of all the parties concerned. "We are convinced that they constitute a practical approach towards a genuine disarmament and a lasting peace."

Fan noted that disarmament is not the only issue affecting world peace and security. In international relations, he said, all countries, big or small, should strictly observe the principle of equality and refrain from interfering in the internal affairs or encroaching upon the sovereignty of other countries in any form. The question of nuclear and conventional disarmament involves the matter at the core, he said, adding "The key issue to its solution remains the same -- whether the two superpowers have the goodwill for disarmament and whether they undertake their responsibilities for disarmament."

The Chinese ambassador reiterated that China is consistently opposed to the arms race and stands for disarmament, nuclear disarmament in particular. "Like other countries in the world, China is concerned about the progress in disarmament negotiations," he said.

/9738
CSO: 5200/4037

RELATED ISSUES

PRC 'WORKING PAPER' TO UN URGES DISARMAMENT TALKS

OW090554 Beijing XINHUA in English 0539 GMT 9 May 86

[Text] United Nations, May 8 (XINHUA) -- China today said that arms reduction talks should not be "monopolized" by a few big countries, and multilateral deliberations and negotiations should take a "central role" in disarmament. "As the question of disarmament concerns the security of all countries, it should not be monopolized by a few big powers. Disarmament agreements between them must not jeopardize the interests of other countries," said a working paper China submitted to the U.N. Disarmament Commission today. The paper stressed that "all countries, big or small, militarily strong or weak, should enjoy equal rights to participate in the discussions and settlement of problems related to disarmament."

The working paper was addressed to Ambassador Henning Wegener of Federal Germany, chairman of the 1986 session of the commission, by Fan Guoxiang, Chinese ambassador for disarmament affairs and head of the Chinese delegation to the commission. The paper pointed out that multilateral disarmament deliberations and negotiations and bilateral, small-scaled or regional disarmament negotiations should be complementary and promote each other. But, "as compared with the latter, the former has the central role and primary responsibility," it emphasized.

The document urged the participants in bilateral negotiations to take an active and constructive part in the U.N. disarmament deliberations and multilateral negotiations. Negotiators in bilateral talks "should not overlook or hinder multilateral negotiations on the pretext that similar disarmament issues are being tackled in the bilateral negotiations," it added.

The participants in bilateral, small-scaled or regional disarmament negotiations, it said, "should constantly keep the United Nations and the multilateral negotiating body informed of the developments in their negotiations. It should be more so when the subject matter of their negotiations concerns the wider interests of other countries beyond those of the participants." The document urged all states to strictly abide by the provisions of the U.N. Charter, refrain from actions which might adversely affect the disarmament efforts, and display a constructive approach towards arms talks and the political will to reach agreement.

It is noted that the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in disarmament, and should encourage all disarmament measures and be kept informed of all disarmament efforts and developments, whether unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral, without prejudice to the progress of negotiations.

The United Nations is entitled to consider all international disarmament issues and the implementation of its rights should not be limited or obstructed, it added. It said that the United Nations should constantly oversee the implementation and observance of international disarmament agreements and take prompt and necessary actions against non-compliance. The U.N. Disarmament Commission began a closed-door session on Monday that will continue until the end of this month.

/9274

CSO: 5200/4038

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

JUNE 5, 1986

5
6